DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 035 21 February 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Socialist Countries Submit 'New' MBFR Proposal AA 1
Details of Proposal AA 1
Lomeyko Announcement AA 2
Agreement Possible AA 2
Korniyenko Addresses Conference on Disarmament AA 3
Korniyenko Meets With U.S. Negotiators in Geneva AA 4
Soviet Negotiators Meet With FRG Politicians AA 4
West's MBFR Proposals Lack 'Realism,' 'Reciprocity' AA 5
[Nikolayev in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Feb]
Chervov Discusses New Gorbachev Proposals AA 6
[Budapest NEPSZAVA 19 Feb]
U.S. Continues SDI Program Despite Criticism AA 7
[Bogachev]
SDI Reliance on Computers Found Dangerous AA 8
[Chernyshev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Feb]
'Special Mission' Awaits Europe in Initiative AA 10
[Dadyants in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 13 Feb]
Security Termed Key to Disarmament Issues [Solton] AA 12

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

GDR's Sindermann, FRG's Vogel, Kohl Meet in Bonn CC 1
Western War Games in Korea, Europe Denounced CC 1
DPRK Protests in UN CC 1
'Provocative' Maneuvers in Norway CC 2
[Vavilov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Feb]
Closer EEC-CEMA Economic Cooperation Urged CC 2
U.S. Hinders Peace in Persian Gulf, Indian Ocean CC 3
[Lebedeva]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Leningrad-Seattle Telebridge Program Aired A 1
Lomeyko Criticizes U.S. 'New Globalism' Policy A 10
Report, Comment on Reagan's Visit to Grenada A 11
President To Attend Ceremony [Serikov] A 11
PRAVDA Comments [Gan, 29 Feb] A 11
True Aim of Visit Viewed A 12
Reagan Starts New Campaign To Topple Sandinists A 12
U.S. Prepared for 'Armed Interference' in Haiti A 13
[PRAVDA, 20 Feb]
U.S. Anti-Libyan Campaign Assuming New Proportions A 13
[Vasilyev]
'Discriminatory' Trade Restrictions Criticized A 14
[Ignatyev]
U.S. Aid Program Serves 'Aggressive' Policies A 15

NORTHEAST ASIA

Opposition to 'Team Spirit' Maneuvers Reported C 1
DPRK, Indian Sources Cited [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Feb] C 1
Korean Committee Objects C 1
U.S. Exercises on Okinawa Draw Local Protest C 1
Japan To Cooperate With U.S. on Arms Development C 2

SOUTH ASIA

DRA Army Political Chief Praises USSR Assistance D 1
[Saddiqi in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Feb]
DRA Minister Lauds Government's Broader Base D 3
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 19 Feb]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Post-Election Situation in Philippines Viewed E 1
Transport, Communications Accord Signed With SRV [VNA] E 1
Closer Soviet, Burmese Cooperation Urged [(Klimov)] E 1

EASTERN EUROPE

PPR's Messner Concludes Visit; Statement Issued F 1
Addresses Factory Workers F 1
[PAP]
Departs for Poland F 2
Joint Statement on Visit F 2
[PRAVDA 21 Feb]
Yugoslav Party Plenum Discusses Statute Changes F 5
[PRAVDA 16 Feb]
Romania's Ceausescu Notes Tasks for Food Industry F 5
[PRAVDA 16 Feb]

WESTERN EUROPE

Portuguese Support of SDI 'Pandering' to U.S. G 1
[Anikin]
USSR-UK Commission Urges Closer Cooperation G 1
Rome Trial Prosecutor Continues Summation G 2
[Zavesov in PRAVDA 20 Feb]
USSR-Turkey Cooperation Commission Holds Session G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Fatah Official Arrives in Moscow 20 Feb [INA] H 1
Losev Discusses Mideast With Iraqi Ambassador H 1
Commentaries Stress Need To End Iran-Iraq War H 1
Israel, U.S. Benefit H 2
Diverts Iranians' Attention H 4
Al-'Attas Addresses PDRY Government Session H 5
[IZVESTIYA 20 Feb]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Further Comment, Reportage on Situation in Chad J 1
IZVESTIYA Notes U.S. Role [20 Feb] J 1

Military Force 'Bad Gamble' [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Feb] J 1
U.S. 'Servicemen' Sent J 2
Angolan Statement Protests U.S. Policy in Region J 2
SWAPO Leader: Cuban Troops, Namibia Not Linked J 3
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 19 Feb]
Soviet Naval Ship Calls in Guinea-Bissau
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Feb]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Chilean Communist Party Manifesto for 1986 K 1
Chilean Political Parties Demand End to Exile Policy K 5

SOCIALIST COUNTRIES SUBMIT 'NEW' MBFR PROPOSAL

Details of Proposal

LD201251 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Vienna, February 20 TASS -- A plenary meeting which was held today at talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe was addressed by Ambassador Andre Wieland, leader of the delegation from the German Democratic Republic.

The GDR delegation tabled a detailed draft agreement on the initial reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of land forces and armaments with the subsequent freezing of the levels of armed forces and armaments by the sides on related measures in central Europe. The draft was tabled on behalf of the socialist countries that are taking a direct part in the Vienna negotiations, namely the GDR, Poland, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

The NATO countries were invited to get down to working out a mutually acceptable agreement on the basis of this draft. While preserving all fundamental provisions of the socialist countries' proposal of February 14, 1985, the new draft develops, specifies and amplifies them in many ways.

It takes into account those elements in the Western negotiators' position, on a number of important aspects where the sides lack agreement. The basic provisions of the draft agreement are as follows:

-- Within one year after the agreement's entry into force the Soviet Union and the United States pull out respectively 11,500 and 6,500 servicemen of their land forces together with their organic armaments and combat hardware from the area of central Europe to within their national territories. The lists of the military units to be reduced and withdrawn are to be exchanged in advance, before the agreement is signed.

-- All the eleven direct participants in the talks undertake after the reduction of the Soviet and American forces is completed not to increase the numerical strength and armaments of their land forces and air forces in central Europe for three years.

-- After the no-increase commitment becomes effective, annually updated figures concerning the armed forces of the NATO countries and of the Warsaw Treaty countries remaining in the reduction zone will be exchanged.

-- For the period of the reduction of the forces of the USSR and the United States and the subsequent period, during which the no-increase (freeze) commitment is in effect, three or four permanent verification posts will be established each on the western and eastern sides of the reduction area. All formations, units and subunits of the land forces of the parties to the agreement will enter or leave the reduction area through these posts. The posts will be manned by representatives of both sides.

-- It is provided that the sides will give advance notification on a reciprocal basis of such military activities as troop movements, the callup of reservists, and military exercises involving 20,000 or more men.

-- Along with the use of national technical means of verification in order to ensure compliance with the agreement, the possibility of conducting on-site inspections on justified request is not ruled out.

-- It is also provided for setting up a consultative commission for a prompt examination of issues connected with the fulfilment of the agreement.

The representative of the GDR said that as they formulated the verification measures, the Warsaw Treaty countries proceeded from the task of reliably ensuring the fulfilment of the obligations to reduce and freeze armed forces in central Europe and the essential proportionality of these measures with the content and nature of the suggested agreement. They also gave consideration to the peculiarities of the present-day international situation which remains complicated and tense. The draft agreement tabled by the socialist countries represents a realistical basis for a possible accord in Vienna.

Lomeyko Announcement

LD201225 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 20 Feb 86

["New Proposal by Socialist Countries in Vienna" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow, February 20 TASS -- Today socialist states -- direct negotiators at the Vienna talks on reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe -- came forward with a renewed draft "Agreement on an Initial Cutback in Land Forces and Armaments by the Soviet Union and the United States with a Subsequent Non-Increase in the Levels of the Armed Forces and Armaments of the Sides and on Related Measures in Central Europe."

Having announced this at a briefing for Soviet and foreign correspondents, Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the press department of the USSR Ministry for Foreign Affairs, emphasized that the Soviet Union and other Warsaw-Treaty countries attach much importance to the Vienna talks in the drive to strengthen European security. Such an agreement, as is pointed out in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15, this year, could become a signal for the start of headway towards a reduction in conventional arms and armed forces.

The new initiative of socialist countries develops and specifies the known February (1985) proposal of the Warsaw Treaty member states. It takes into consideration a number of elements of Western negotiators' positions set out in their reply considerations of December 5, last year.

The initiative of the Warsaw Treaty member states brings the stands of the sides substantially closer together, including those in the sphere of verification of the observance of the agreement. Pertaining to this are proposals on establishing three-four permanently functioning verification stations to monitor the entry of any military contingents into the cutback zone and their withdrawal from it throughout the entire period of the currency of the agreement; on instituting a consultative commission for the period of the currency of the agreement; a procedure for requests for carrying out on-site inspections; and finally exchanges of numerical data on the armed forces in the cutback area (their strength, movements and exercises) on the basis of reciprocity.

Agreement Possible

LD201420 Moscow TASS in English 1359 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 20 TASS -- The Soviet side considers it possible to reach agreement in Vienna already this year. A basis for that is being furnished by the present proposals of socialist countries, Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the press department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists today.

)wever, this depends not only on the Soviet side. Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of anuary 15, this year, points out that 1986 could become a landmark for the talks in eneva if the other side really strives for that.

espite the modest amounts of cutbacks, the Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasized when nswering journalists' questions, an initial agreement would be of considerable impor- nce. It would get the talks moving after their being stalled for more than 12-odd ears now and would raise their prestige in the eyes of the European public and, finally,)uld promote to a certain extent an improvement of the military- and political climate n Europe and not only in Europe.

Initial cutbacks" in conjunction with non-increase in the levels of troops and armaments)uld contribute to creating a favourable atmosphere for moving on to larger cuts in the rmed forces and armaments on the basis of reciprocity to equal collective ceilings at lower level down to 900,000 men for each side, and those of land forces down to 00,000 men.

ORNIYENKO ADDRESSES CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

0201742 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 20 Feb 86

Text] Geneva, February 20 TASS -- The Soviet leadership, without needlessly drama- izing the situation, at the same time judiciously assesses the period that we, all of s, are living through, as extremely important, as a turning point. Mankind should make choice right now, on the threshhold of the third millennium that will determine its ate, said First Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Georgiy Korniyenko, speaking today t the session of the Conference on Disarmament, which is under way here.

oday mankind has already the means capable of leading it to self-destruction. The oviet people, however, are far from expressing the sentiments to the fact that the ituation is irreparable, that nuclear war is fatally inevitable. We are sure that there s the real possibility of making a radical turn for the better in the development of he international situation, of preventing the outbreak of the arms race with its easily redictable consequences.

he Soviet State, he said, in its policies always -- both in the pre-war and post-war ears -- gave preference to the ideas of collective security, based on the carefully erified balance of interests of all countries. However, in the past we dealt with he idea that ensuring collective security was the way of preference. While today, this s, in our profound conviction, the only possible way. In the nuclear age security of tates, as M.S. Gorbachev pointed out, "is possible only as security for all".

nother basic element of the new approach to ensuring international security should be he understanding and recognition by all that this task can only be resolved by poli- ical and not by military and technological means. A search -- even a sincere one -- or military and technological means of ensuring security can bring about only the same ndless escalation of the arms race with the fully predictable consequences.

uch is our philosophy of moving towards a safe world, which underlies the practical olicies of the USSR in matters of stopping the arms race and achieving real disarma- ent, said G. Korniyenko.

he Soviet Union's expanded proposals on a broad range of those issues have been set orth in the statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail orbachev dated January 15 of this year, the main integral part of which is the rogramme for a stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world efore the end of this century.

In determining the content of the practical measures, envisaged by the programme, in their distributing by stages and establishing interconnection between these measures, [as received] the Soviet Union was guided above all by the consideration that no damage should be inflicted upon anybody's security in any moment of implementation of the programme.

The inalienable part of the proposed programme is a ban on creation, tests and deployment of strike space weapons, the ban without which one cannot hope at all for a possibility of eliminating nuclear weapons. And this is prompted by the consideration of doing no damage to anybody's security, and, the more so, preventing military superiority of one of the sides.

Disclosing the arguments, which were cited in the West to justify the American SDI programme, the speaker said that the posing of the task of creating a space-based ABM system, irrespective of a stage of its realisation, runs counter to the letter and spirit of the 1972 treaty on limitation of ABM systems.

Speaking of the objective interrelation between the questions of strategic nuclear arms and space strike weapons, Georgiy Korniyenko emphasized that the Soviet nuclear disarmament programme is structured in such a way -- and this is yet another of its distinctive features -- that the nature of interelation between its various components is different: While with regard to some of them no solutions are possible without simultaneously resolving other issues, certain measures can also be implemented independently.

Among major problems which can be discussed and resolved outside the framework of the general programme he mentioned the question of reduction of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone and the question of ending tests of nuclear weapons.

Speaking about the Conference on Disarmament in general, he said in conclusion, I would like to state very clearly that the Soviet leadership, as is confirmed by the message of Mikhail Gorbachev to the conference, views it as an important and, in a way, unique forum, where representatives of 40 nations -- large and small, socialist and capitalist, belonging to military alliances and non-aligned, located in various geographic regions of the world participate in the consideration and elaboration of decision on disarmament issues.

KORNIYENKO MEETS WITH U.S. NEGOTIATORS IN GENEVA

LD201913 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 20 TASS -- Georgiy Kornieyenko, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., had a conversation here today with the leaders of the U.S. delegation to the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space arms, ambassadors Max Kampelman, John Tower and Maynard Glitman. The conversation in which the leaders of the delegation of the U.S.S.R., ambassadors Viktor Karpov and Alexey Obukhov, took part, touched upon questions discussed in the negotiations.

SOVIET NEGOTIATORS MEET WITH FRG POLITICIANS

LD211005 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Vienna, February 21 TASS -- The leaders of the delegations from socialist countries to Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe have met here with a group of members of the West German Bundestag's subcommission on disarmament and arms control, which was led by subcommission chairman Egon Bahr. Head of the Soviet Delegation Valerian Mikhaylov was among those taking part in the meeting.

The attention of the West German MP's was called to the importance of the draft basic provisions of an agreement on initial cuts by the Soviet Union and the United States in their land forces and armaments in central Europe and the subsequent freezing of the levels of armed forces and armaments there, which has been tabled at the talks by the socialist countries. It was stressed that seeking to provide a realistic and business-like basis for a mutually acceptable agreement in Vienna, the Warsaw Treaty states have incorporated a number of new and important elements in their negotiating position.

WEST'S MBFR PROPOSALS LACK 'REALISM,' 'RECIPROCITY'

PM201424 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[D. Nikolayev article under the rubric "Events and Opinions": "Moving From a Standstill"]

[Text] The large-scale peace initiatives advanced in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, reveal a practical way of achieving progress at talks in all areas of disarmament. This, of course, also applies to the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and armaments in central Europe.

The dialogue between the Warsaw Pact states and NATO countries has been under way now for more than 12 years. The reason for the standstill -- up to now no substantial results have been achieved -- lies in the NATO countries' unconstructive and unrealistic position and their claims for a so-called asymmetrical (significantly greater for Warsaw Pact countries than for NATO countries) reduction of troops. The groundlessness of these claims by the West was shown, in particular, during an exchange of numerical data. It showed that in central Europe there is an approximate balance in the correlation of NATO and Warsaw Pact military forces. Progress in Vienna is also hampered by the NATO countries' unwillingness to extend reduction and limitation to armaments. Finally, a serious obstacle is the artificially exaggerated claims of the West on verification [kontrol], which in no way corresponds to the scale and volume of measures for a practical reduction in the level of military confrontation. The sum total of this brought about the NATO countries' unwillingness to consider the socialist states' proposals in a businesslike and serious way.

Many such proposals have been submitted in Vienna. Take, for instance, the socialist countries' initiative on reducing, over 1 year, a certain proportion of Soviet and U.S. forces and their conventional arms and combat equipment, with a subsequent 2-year freeze on the level of forces and arms.

This initiative provided a real opportunity for concrete results in a practical reduction of the excessive concentration of arms in central Europe.

However, the NATO countries avoided a businesslike discussion of this constructive proposal for almost a whole year. Yet, in December, at the very end of the regular round, the West advanced their reciprocal views. The NATO representatives support initial reductions of Soviet and U.S. forces, although in lesser volumes and without taking arms into account.

The very fact of a response by the Western participants to the socialist countries' proposals can be assessed positively. But, at the same time it must be observed that the West's response contains elements that do not meet the requirements of realism and the principle of reciprocity and nondetriment to either side.

The latest round of talks in Geneva began 30 January under unusual conditions.

At the center of the participants' attention were the Soviet proposals advanced in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev. The Soviet side at the highest level again confirmed our country's principled position that, together with the removal of weapons of mass destruction from states' arsenals, conventional arms and armed forces should become a subject for agreed reductions.

CHERVOV DISCUSSES NEW GORBACHEV PROPOSALS

AU201309 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 19 Feb 86 p 2

[APN report: "The Main Goal: To Avoid the Danger -- Colonel General Chervov on the Particular Features of the Soviet Disarmament Proposals"]

[Text] Evaluating the new peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, Colonel General Chervov, the well-known Soviet military policy expert, pointed out that Gorbachev's declaration expressed the historic program of turning from decades of nuclear arms race towards real disarmament. The essence of the program is the elimination of nuclear arsenals by the year 2000.

Analyzing the various aspects of the nuclear disarmament program, Colonel General Chervov pointed out particular features of the Soviet proposal for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The essence of the first feature is that the program does not harm anyone's security interests in any phase. The military-strategic balance would be maintained at a steadily decreasing level and strategic stability would be guaranteed. The measures to be implemented would be inspected in every phase by national and international means and also by on-site observation. The verification is thorough, efficient, strict, and reliable. Verification also includes laboratory inspection. This inspection is aimed at ensuring that the armament does not spread to outer space. The Soviet Union is ready to agree on any other form of verification. The second feature is that keeping outer space free of arms is of key importance from the point of view of the implementation of the entire program. The U.S. Administration's speculation about keeping space out of the framework of agreements is an illusory one.

The U.S. plans connected with space strike weapons are part of a uniform offensive strategy. However, there can be no winner in a nuclear war; neither the arms race nor SDI change this fact. One must draw appropriate conclusions from this. The task should be to start eliminating nuclear weapons and not create space strike weapons.

An agreement on banning the deployment of space strike weapons could mean beginning the Soviet program of eliminating nulcear weapons. This is a realistic goal that can be achieved.

In the first three rounds of the Geneva talks, however, the U.S. side unfortunately did not show a readiness to halt the spread of the arms race into space. Without this, however, it is impossible to imagine a radical reducation of nuclear weapons.

The third feature is connected with intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe. In order to achieve a radical change in the European situation and outside the continent, the Soviet Union has submitted numerous initiatives aimed at achieving just and efficient agreements.

On 7 April 1985, the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of its intermediate-range missiles and halted any kind of countermeasures in Europe, dismantled [leserelte] the additionally deployed SS-20 missiles and eliminated felszamolta] their launching installations.

At present, there are only 243 SS-20 missiles in the European area. We have completely eliminated the SS-5 intermediate-range weapons and we are continuing to dismantle the SS-4 missiles. Our country declared a unilateral moratorium on all kinds of nuclear explosions, as on 6 August 1985, and we extended its validity until 31 March 1986. Our constructive proposals, which -- if the United States also desires -- can serve as a good basis for achieving mutually acceptable agreements, are on the negotiating table in Geneva.

These measures, however, have not found a positive reply from the United States so far.

The fourth feature of the proposal is that this Soviet nuclear disarmament proposal affects all nuclear powers in the world. This is understandable. If the final task is the complete elimination of nuclear arms from the earth, then it is natural that every nuclear big power must take part in this project.

The first phase of the Soviet plan does not stipulate that England and France simultaneously reduce their nuclear arms with the Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms reduction. We are only talking about their freezing them. This is the just way. It would be unnatural for the Soviet Union and the United States to begin radically reducing their nuclear arsenals and for England and France to advance in the opposite direction, on the road to accumulating nuclear arms (possibly with U.S. contributions).

At their meeting on 27-28 January, Mikhail Gorbachev and PCI [Italian Communist Party] General Secretary Alessandro Natta stressed that the most important goal to be achieved is to remove the threat of nuclear war hanging over mankind, to make the international situation radically healthier, and to guarantee the peoples' lasting security.

U.S. CONTINUES SDI PROGRAM DESPITE CRITICISM

LD171742 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 17 Feb 86

["Strike Weapons in Space Would Cancel Out Prospects for Disarmament on Earth" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, February 17 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Six years ago the then Secretary of Defence, Harold Brown, admitted in his last report to Congress on the U.S. military budget that an attempt at creating a U.S. large-scale anti-missile defence system would prove unacceptably costly, destabilising and, for sure, doomed to failure.

The work which is now under way in the United States to implement the "star wars" programme is confirming the conclusion drawn by the former Pentagon chief. Information as to "insurmountable obstacles", "engineering problems" and "scientific setbacks" which pursue the creators of a U.S. "space shield" filters into the Western press.

In the face of sharp criticism inside the United States for the spending of huge funds for the creation of an "anti-missile shield" which, it turns out, would inevitably be holey, U.S. Administration spokesmen do not venture to admit that the true goal of the "star wars" programme is by no means defense but the creation of a first-nuclear-strike capability.

They prefer to shift and dodge by putting forward new less and less convincing arguments in defence of the "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI). General James Abrahamson, director of the U.S. "star wars" programme, has stated in London that a U.S. anti-missile defence system should not necessarily ensure a hundred percent defence against offensive missiles. According to Abrahamson, penetration by 8,000 missiles with the lack of an anti-missile defence system would mean the start of headway towards "the end of our civilization" whereas the "star wars" programme with all its imperfection would be able to reduce damage to an acceptable level. General Abrahamson obviously dissembles his feelings when he tries to convince the British of the advantages of the option of a space strategy of mortal risk over an alternative of reducing the risk of nuclear war through talks and agreements.

Even according to the most "upbeat" estimates by the "star wars" advocates, the efficiency of a U.S. "anti-missile shield" would not exceed 80-90 percent. For an all-out destruction of civilization, much less than 10-20 percent of missiles breaking through to targets are needed. The burst of one percent of the now existing nuclear missiles would produce a devastating effect equal to 5,000 missiles of Hiroshoma bombing type.

According to scientists' estimates, as a result of the burst of 100-150-megaton nuclear fuel -- 11-16 U.S. "Titan" ICBMs -- over the largest cities of Europe, Asia, and or the Americas would bring about, apart from everything else, huge clouds of soot of enormous dimentions, which would result in an inevitable onset of "nuclear winter" on earth for three months. That period of time would be quite enough to do away with life on earth.

Contrary to the assertions of U.S. General Abrahamson, there would be practically no difference between the bursts of twenty big nuclear missiles and 8,000 missiles. To the human race, anyhow. Any nuclear war with the use of ABM systems or without them would lead to the end of life on earth.

Mankind should enter the third millenium with a "star peace" programme, and not with the "star wars" one. To prevent the arms race's spreading over to outer space means to remove the obstacle to deep cuts in nuclear arms and to complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction already in the current century. It is precisely such programme that the Soviet Union is suggesting to the world.

SDI RELIANCE ON COMPUTERS FOUND DANGEROUS

PM141427 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS military observer V. Chernyshev article: "Civilization Hostage to Machines?"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is strongly convinced that the "star wars" program increases the threat of war and can at a certain point make it probable. Such is the assessment made by Mikhail Gorbachev in his answers to questions put by the newspaper L'HUMANITE.

This danger increases as a result of a number of factors. First, as a result of unrealistic ideas prevalent in the United States about its own invulnerability and illusions about its being possible to deliver a nuclear first strike from beneath a space "shield" and prevent, or at least reduce to an "acceptable level," a counterstrike.

Second, because of changes in the material basis of the sides' military potential and concomitant disappearance of the very concept of strategic stability and transformation of the present strategic chaos.

The unstable conditions, the unpredictable development of events, and the impossibility of confident strategic planning will make it necessary in a crisis or near-crisis situation for decisions, which can prove fatal to the whole world, to be made with utmost speed. Nuclear war can start under these conditions not just as the result of a deliberate decision, but also through attempts at blackmail, inaccurate assessment by one side of the other's actions, or as the consequence of some unconsidered act caused by an unexpected deterioration of the situation.

Third and last, as the result of technical errors and malfunctioning of the extremely complex computer systems. Any system in a "star wars" vein will have computers instead of people. Since it will have to react quickly and "decisively," there will be no time for human intervention, no time, for example, to "wake up the President," let alone "call the National Security Council" before the United States starts a war. As a result of the deployment of space strike arms a situation would be created in which fundamentally important decisions with irreversible consequences would essentially be made by computers without the participation of human reason or political will and without regard to moral or ethical criteria. In such a situation mankind would become hostage to machines and consequently, their technical hitches and malfunctions. Senator P. Tsongas once cracked a somewhat lugubrious joke on this matter. He suggested that the computer in charge of the U.S. Armed Forces should be elected president of the country. Black humor, is it not?

The recent catastrophe with the Challenger spacecraft illustrated the future danger to the whole world. Yet that was a reliable system which had been repeatedly tested and checked. SDI will be much more complex and the price paid for a technical error on its part will be the destruction of an enormous spaceship, planet earth, whose crew comprises the whole of mankind.

To appreciate just how complex the "star wars" system will be, we will compare its future computer program with the Challenger's. In the last 9 minutes before the ship's takeoff, for example, when all operations are taken over by automatic computer control, 88,000 commands are issued. Whereas the program designed to operate the "star wars" system will, according to specialists' calculations, consist of 10-100 million commands.

It is impossible to predict all the circumstances which such a system may actually encounter and it is only possible to test and check it in the conditions in which it is designed to function, that is to say, in conditions of war. Relying on a program that has not actually been checked is like having a set of short-circuiting switches in a place where you store a lot of gasoline. The slightest failure of the system will lead to nuclear war and it will not be possible to "go back" to iron out the kinks and analyze the situation.

Aside from computer errors themselves, war could be started by them as a result of solar activity confusing all the sensors or through misleading effects caused by the northern lights. A disintegrating satellite could be taken for an approaching missile warhead by a sensor and a fire on a gas pipeline in the opposing side's territory as the launching of a ballistic missile, and so forth.

It is time that Washington officialdom realized it is dealing with weapons which can blow up the entire world and which it will not be able, even with the most thorough "care," to control. The desire to "suspend" space strike weapons above the earth will lead, in the words of former U.S. Defense Secretary H. Brown to a "nightmare which we will hand down to our children in the 21st century." Mankind can and must enter that century not only without space weapons and nuclear weapons, but without any weapons of mass destruction at all.

'SPECIAL MISSION' AWAITS EUROPE IN INITIATIVE

PM131501 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 13 Feb 86 p 3

[International observer G. Dadyants article: "Europe's special Mission"]

[Text] The old cities of Europe differ from each other. It is hard to draw parallels between the Grand Place in Brussels and the Place de la Concorde in Paris, between the Acropolis in Athens and the Kremlin in Moscow. But it is not for nothing that Budapest is called "little Paris," and Stockholm the "Venice of the north."

Europe -- West and East -- is not just a unified architectural and cultural ensemble. It is united by the hill of Waterloo and the fields of Borodino, by the ovens of Majdanek and the ruins of Oradour-sur-Glane, and by the memorials to war victims in Vologograd and near Verdun. Nowhere in the world are there so many mass graves as in Europe. European soil is soaked -- in the full sense of the word -- in the blood of its people.

Let us say right away that the ideological and political split is a natural phenomenon for Europe. For it was right here that first the Bastille and then, the Winter Palace were taken. It was here that the historic dispute between two sociopolitical formations -- capitalism and socialism -- began. But today's military confrontation has been imposed on Europe from outside.

Europe is now crammed -- in the full sense of the word -- with missiles with nuclear charges, each of which could wipe from the face of the earth an entire city with all of its ancient cathedrals, unique picture galleries, and the millions of people inhabiting it. The "security" presented to Western Europe by the United States means life on a powder keg to which the fuse has already been attached.

The United States has not only intimidated Western Europe with the imaginary "threat from the East." With the help of false, unscrupulous anti-Soviet propaganda it is trying to efface from the peoples' minds the memory of whom they owe their liberation from fascist barbarity to. This propaganda is successful. Many young people who live in Boulevard Stalingrad in Paris know nothing about Stalingrad. They judge the Russians by watching U.S. movies like "Red Dawn" on theater and television screens.

Why is a considerable part of the new Soviet peace initiatives advanced in M.S. Gorbachev's statement addressed directly to Europe? Because it is not just nuclear missiles that have been building up here over the past 20 years. Experience with peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous cooperation has also been building up in defiance of the missiles. At first glance it is paradoxical, for example, that the FRG -- where a large part of the missiles targeted on the Soviet Union are concentrated -- has become the USSR's top trading partner in the capitalist world. And France, where anti-Soviet hysteria is particularly strong, had a special relationship with the Soviet Union for many years and, by all accounts, is not averse to reviving it now.

I have visited many countries in Western and Eastern Europe, worked in France for several years, and met with ministers and with presidents and general directors of major West European industrial corporations. Of course, they were capitalists who do not recognize our ideals and, what is more, who doggedly struggle against them. But I have never heard a single anti-Soviet attack from the lips of a "businessman." This dirty work has been farmed out to the mass misinformation media working under U.S. licenses.

If we look more deeply, two trends with regard to the Soviet Union are now fighting each other in Western Europe, as in the years preceding World War II: The class instinct pushes the bourgeoisie toward zoological anti-Sovietism, while national interests push toward cooperation with the Soviet Union.

All the anti-Soviet scribbling in which the right-wing French press, which has been bought up en masse by Hersant, engages cannot hide the fact that it is only thanks to cooperation with the Soviet Union that France has been able to pursue a policy independent of the United States in the international arena. Let us recall that General de Gaulle made his historic visit to the Soviet Union in 1966 immediately after he withdrew France from NATO's military organization.

It is significant that, however hard people tried to frighten Europe with "Soviet tanks," which could supposedly take Paris with a single strike, it was precisely in Europe that the process of international detente began in the late sixties and early seventies. The Moscow treaty between the Soviet Union and the FRG, the "Principles of Cooperation Between the USSR and France," and a number of other documents signed during those years laid the foundations for the Final Act of the Helsinki CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe]. The "10 commandments" of European peace still serve as an example of new thinking, new political psychology, and a new approach to problems of international cooperation.

What must be done today to rid Europe of the fear of nuclear war and the mistrust being fanned among its peoples?

It is hard to say what Europeans fear more now -- the Soviet SS-20 missiles with which they have been intimidated or the U.S. Pershing-2's which have been imposed on them. The Soviet Union proposes ridding Europe of all nuclear missiles -- primarily medium-range missiles -- at the very first stage. It is precisely these missiles, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in his replies to L'HUMANITE's questions, that seriously undermine European security. Do we not have a right to count on the realism and prudence of British and, of course, French policy in this question?

One of the favorite arguments of opponents of ridding the continent of nuclear weapons has always been the claim that Western Europe would then be left "defenseless" in the face of the, allegedly, "far superior" Soviet conventional armed forces. But the proposals advanced by M.S. Gorbachev also concern conventional arms -- their significant and balanced reduction under strict international control [kontrol]. Any other questions, gentlemen?

No, there are no more questions. What is needed is answers -- answers to the point.

The U.S. TIME magazine has been forced to state that the Soviet leader's proposals have been "drawn up so as to at once please many inhabitants of European countries who are alarmed at the nuclear missiles deployed on their territory or targeted on them." The Soviet plan, THE WASHINGTON POST acknowledges, "opens up the prospect of allaying Europe's nuclear anxieties."

In all probability, what is good for Europe is not very good for the United States. Having recovered from the initial shock, NEWSWEEK magazine tries to persuade Western Europe that the Soviet proposal is "fraught with deadly danger for it." It incites Britain and France, in particular, to refuse to accept the proposal for a "freeze" on their nuclear arsenals. In its cynicism NEWSWEEK goes so far as to say that the abandonment of nuclear weapons.... "can bring Europe only total non-nuclear war." The same old story -- about how Soviet tanks will burst into Paris -- begins all over again.

It is not so simple, it turns out, to abandon the customary logic of confrontation, what the French call "esprit de clocher" -- looking at the world from one's own low bell tower.

The Soviet proposals give Europe a unique opportunity to become a continent of peace and international cooperation. What is more, as M.S. Gorbachev emphasized, a special mission -- the new building of detente -- could fall to Europe's lot.

There is no need to say what broad horizons of cooperation would in that case be opened up before all European peoples and before the two parts of Europe, which have always complemented each other not only in the cultural sphere, but also in the economic, scientific, and technical spheres.

The Soviet Union has concluded economic, scientific, and technical agreements with a number of West European countries for the period right through the next millennium. But has anyone in the West calculated what benefits the establishment of official relations and business contacts between the EEC and CEMA will bring to the European peoples? Neither the United States nor Japan possesses such strong economic, industrial, raw material, scientific, and technical potential as Europe could possess if all-European cooperation could be arranged.

In drawing up its plans for "star wars" today, the United States is thoughtlessly risking the fate of world civilization, whose cradle is Europe. It is essentially pushing Europe onto the path of self-destruction, turning it into a battlefield for a war which it will be unable to survive. It is the duty of all Europeans, despite the differences which exist among us, the different ideology, and the different views on basic human values, to save modern civilization from the catastrophe which threatens it. Today this, too, is Europe's special mission.

SECURITY TERMED KEY TO DISARMAMENT ISSUES

LD201903 Moscow World Service in English 1531 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Yuriy Solton commentary read by two unidentified speakers]

[Excerpts] [First speaker] When was the arms race started and who began it? The arms race began when the United States dropped atom bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945. It has now led to a situation described as the nuclear deadlock. A mere fraction of the nuclear stockpiles accumulated in the world today is enough to wipe out all life on earth and turn the planet into a desert. But the nuclear weapons are still manufactured and more and more nuclear weapons are put on production lines. The nuclear weapons are becoming more destructive and sophisticated and more difficult to control. The risk of a nuclear conflict by accident, technical error, or irresponsibility is growing. Consider this example: Every year over 5,000 drug addicts, alcoholics, and mentally unbalanced people are dismissed from the American military personnel having direct access to nuclear weapons.

[Second speaker] In other words, the threat of a nuclear holocaust is now hanging over every home and every family. Is there a way out?

[First speaker] Washington is hoping for a defensive space shield to be set up under the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan, better known as "star wars." In his recent State of the Union address the President said that the security shield will one day make all nuclear weapons obsolete and deliver the human race from the nuclear nightmare.

[Second speaker] Let us assume that it is possible to build such a shield, although authoritative scientists, and among them American, describe that as an illusion and a waste of money.

[First speaker] Indeed, it will take decades to build such a shield and meanwhile, nuclear weapons continue to be made and grow in sophistication. In its new long-term directives the Pentagon named its top priorities as the "star wars" and offensive nuclear weapons. There can be no question of making nuclear weapons obsolete as far as the Pentagon is concerned.

According to its plans, the offensive nuclear potential is to add attack space weapons capable of hitting targets in space and on the ground. Will that help people of the earth to live in peace?

[Second speaker] Well let's make another assumption. Both the United States and the Soviet Union hold defense space shields. Will world security grow in that case? Let us hear the thoughts of the head of the chief staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, General Nikolay Chervov. Here is what he said in a roundtable television show.

[First speaker] Gen Chervov is saying that even if we imagine that both the Soviet Union and the United States have built space shields, the situation would be extremely unstable and critical. Estimates show that even a very slight advantage of one side in the effectiveness of its space shield and in the effectiveness of its defenses will immediately destabilize the situation. Another important consideration here is that the control of space weapons and the making of crucial and irreversible decisions will be done by computers.

[Second speaker] This will make the human civilization a hostage of machines which are liable to throw up faults and malfunctions. Speaking in the same television discussion, Academician Roald Sagdeyev who heads the Soviet Institute of Space Studies gave this assessment of the consequences.

[First speaker] Academician Sagdeyev says that ensuring the reliability of such an ultrasophisticated system from the purely technological point of view is a problem that cannot be resolved. Computers will have to be developed storing in their memories instructions and codes for a course of action compiled in advance for the whole system to react to any imaginable situation. Such a system will have to take into acoount tens of thousands and even hundreds of thousands of bodies moving in space and among them all kinds of dummy targets. The total number of such instructions will be of the order of tens of millions of display screen lines. It is a theoretical improbability to compile a file of absolutely correct instructions and account for every contingency. Even a test of such a system may lead to a tragedy like the Challenger disaster, only very much worse.

[Second speaker] In other words, the so-called space security shield will not strengthen anyone's security.

[First speaker] As a result, the whole world would be up against an arms race going ahead out of control, strategic chaos and universal uncertainty, and fear as the risk of a holocaust continues to escalate. That danger will be hanging over this generation if the United States persists in its commitment to "star wars." The Americans are dreaming of getting out of the nuclear deadlock by means of new ultimate weapons and technical wizardry and they want absolute security for themselves and absolute insecurity for the rest of the world.

Let us take the political attitudes for a start. In 1982 the Soviet Union assumed a unilateral pledge never to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The United States refused to follow suit. The United States military doctrine does not rule out the delivery of a first or, as Washington puts it, preemptive strike. The strategic nuclear missiles it deploys in Western Europe and other parts of the world are designed for that very purpose. According to United States plans, attack space weapons conveniently called a security shield should first of all increase the United States' offensive nuclear potential by a factor of ten and give the United States a chance to launch nuclear aggression with impunity against the Soviet Union or any other nation.

There can be no security for the Soviet Union without security for the United States, and there can be no security for the nations of the Warsaw Treaty organization without security for the nations of NATO in this day and age. There can be no world security without their mutual security.

GDR'S SINDERMANN, FRG'S VOGEL, KOHL MEET IN BONN

LD201847 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Bonn, February 20 TASS -- There is no more important task for all countries today than the task of struggling for peace, Horst Sindermann, president of the People's Chamber of the GDR, who leads a delegation of the People's Chamber of the GDR on an official visit to West Germany, has stated at his meeting with Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the faction of the Social-Democratic Party of the West German Bundestag.

He stressed that the paramount goal today was to learn to live together in the world rather than die in the flames of nuclear war. The Soviet Union has shown its goodwill by putting forward new initiatives for disarmament and the USA should follow that example.

The GDR believes, Sindermann says, that relations between the two German states constitute an important component of European cooperation as a whole. These relations should not complicate the situation in Europe but, conversely, contribute to the broadening of peaceful cooperation. Relations between the parliaments of the two countries should contribute to the establishment of an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding between the GDR and West Germany.

Hans-Jochen Vogel said for his part that despite their differences of opinion, all the countries were united by the need to fight for the prevention of nuclear war.

Horst Sindermann also had meetings with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and with Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, at which the sides discussed outstanding international problems and questions of the development of bilateral relations.

WESTERN WAR GAMES IN KOREA, EUROPE DENOUNCED

DPRK Protests in UN

LD142140 Moscow TASS in English 1945 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] New York, February 14 TASS -- The large-scale military exercise, code-named Team Spirit 86, launched by the American and South Korean military, is an aggressive action directed against the reduction of tension in Korea and the creation of a favourable situation for North-South dialogue, says a letter by the mission of the permanent observer of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea at the United Nations to the Security Council president.

The exercise, notes the letter circulated as a document of the Security Council, damages security in Asia and all over the world. The aggressive actions by the United States and the South Korean authorities leave no doubt that they disregard the interest of peace and dialogue.

The dangerous developments now taking place in the Korean Peninsula persistently demand more vigorous efforts against the imperialist actions, for the immediate withdrawal of the U.S. Armed Forces from South Korea and the peaceful unification of Korea.

'Provocative' Maneuvers in Norway

PM201428 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Feb 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS observer V. Vavilov "Commentary for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA": "Maneuvers in Northern Europe"]

[Text] "Anchor Express-86" is the codename of the NATO countries' latest major maneuvers, which began on 15 February. An official spokesman for the staff of the supreme allied commander Europe reported that the maneuvers would take place on the territory of northern Norway on land, in its airspace, and in coastal waters.

So, once again, for a whole month, northern Europe will be an arena for major NATO war games. According to NATO headquarters' plans, more than 20,000 servicemen from the ground forces, air forces, and navies of NATO countries -- the United States, Britain, Canada, FRG, Norway, Italy, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg too -- will rehearse "interaction between units of all categories of the armed forces" and carry out "tasks relating to transferring NATO reinforcements -- 'NATO mobile forces' -- to northern regions of Norway."

The NATO maneuvers are obviously provocative. They are being held in direct proximity to the USSR's borders. The NATO strategists were also at great pains to create what they regarded as a "favorable" atmosphere for the maneuvers -- an atmosphere of anti-Soviet hysteria.

NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington visited Scandinavia recently and held forth about the "decisive significance of the northern flank of NATO," that is, Norway and Denmark, for the whole of the North Atlantic bloc. He made a point of reiterating, as the Swedish news agency TT reported, the tiresome litany of the "Soviet threat," the "substantial increase in the might of the Soviet Navy in the north," and the "Warsaw Pact's patent superiority."

There followed a visit by U.S. General B. Rogers, supreme allied commander Europe. He really laid it on thick in Oslo talking about the "Soviet danger" that allegedly threatens northern Europe, and he suggested that the "only solution" was for the northern NATO allies -- Norway and Denmark -- to increase their military expenditure. Otherwise, REUTER cites his words, NATO would be unable to send reinforcements to Scandinavia in the event of a "crisis situation" there.

The NATO strategists have done a lot of homework. But one thing they did not allow for is the fact that the vast majority of the population of the northern states want to see their countries free from nuclear weapons, from foreign troops, and from foreign military bases. And they see the guarantees of their security not in the continuation of the arms race, but in peace and good-neighborliness.

CLOSER EEC-CEMA ECONOMIC COOPERATION URGED

LD201143 Moscow TASS in English 1103 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 20 TASS -- The member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) come out in favour of improving world economic relations through strict observance of the principles of equality, mutual benefit, respect for the interests of one another, and renunciation of discrimination and of the use of trade as a means of political pressure, Academician Oleg Bogomolov writes in an article published in the Soviet weekly NEW TIMES dated February 21.

Academician Bogomolov emphasizes that it is essential jointly to look for optimum solutions to regulate the economic life of the world community and to bring about favourable conditions for trade exchanges, for pressing restructuring of world production and trade patterns, for the rational utilization of raw materials and energy resources, and for environmental protection. It would be useful to elaborate an effective reform of the international monetary system, to formalize juridically and improve relations between CMEA and the European Economic Community (EEC) and to work out measures to build mutual trust in the economic sphere as well. The problems of economic protection of the countries of the world, including European ones, from any upsets in the system of world economic relations become increasingly topical. This is what the Soviet Union draws attention to at the United Nations Organization.

The initiatives of CMEA countries and of the CMEA Secretariat for improving relations with EEC, the article goes on, are prompted not so much by commercial motives as by considerations of strengthening European security and trust and of gradually overcoming European disunity. The asymmetry of trade relations between East and West is so far aggravated by EEC's desire to do business with each CMEA country separately. It does not recognize the CMEA's role of coordinator and upholder of the interests of its members. A proposal to the effect that the two integration groupings adopt a joint declaration determining the sides' striving for contacts and possible areas of contacts is getting struck in the talks. "Meanwhile," the author points out, "a safe future of Europe, in my view, presupposes an intensification of integration processes not only in the continent's West and East but also deeper all-European contacts at the levels of both individual states and communities of states."

Businesslike cooperation with socialist states which develop their economies on the basis of five-year plans and long-term programs can introduce an element of stability and greater strength to the system of foreign economic contacts of Western countries, particularly European ones, Oleg Bogomolov emphasizes. The CMEA countries' plans for the current five-year period (1986-1990) are a reliable reference point for those business circles which are interested in widening long-term trade-and-economic contacts with socialist countries on the basis of reciprocity and mutual benefit and in a search for new intensive forms of such cooperation.

U.S. HINDERS PEACE IN PERSIAN GULF, INDIAN OCEAN

NC191557 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Vera Lebedeva commentary]

[Text] Monday, 17 February, marked the first day of the week that the WPC initiated to celebrate the struggles to remove imperialist military bases from the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf.

Countries of the region are striving to turn the Indian Ocean into a peace zone. This idea originated with the nonaligned countries and was approved by the 1971 UN General Assembly session.

However, many obstacles prevent this idea from becoming a reality. The main obstacle is the U.S. imperialist policy, which ignores the wishes of this region for peace and cooperation. The U.S. carries out military preparations here and prevents the formation of an international conference to discuss affairs of the Indian Ocean region.

U.S. machinations in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf increased, particularly after the revolution in Afghanistan, the downfall of the monarchy in Iran, the abrogation of the CENTO and SEATO military pacts, and after the OPEC members gained control of their oil wealth.

PRAVDA recently wrote that the objective behind the persistent escalation of U.S. military strength in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf is primarily to insure that the United States could inflict a nuclear blow on the Soviet Union to paralyze its defense and economy. PRAVDA pointed out that the other objective it to quiet the wave of national liberation movements which [words indistinct] and to prevent liberated countries from strengthening their economies and defending their wealth.

The Iran-Iraq war, which has been continuing for 5 years and 5 months, has greatly aggravated the regional situation. This war has destroyed Iranian and Iraqi cities and villages, oil resources and oilpipes, palm groves and [word indistinct]. One million Iranians and Iraqis have died, and the number of victims increases daily. These losses are not (?the only damage). The bloody and useless Iran-Iraq war may become a universal war because it gives the imperialists a pretext to inferfere in regional affairs and to prepare for aggression.

During recent discussions with his Iraqi counterpart, Tariq 'Aziz, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze stated that imperialist forces, whose interest is the aggravation of regional tension, should not be allowed to exploit the ongoing war.

Deadly nuclear weapons long ago were sent to U.S. military bases near Iran's borders. These weapons have been deployed on U.S. aircraft carriers and bombers in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. On several occasions, Washington studied the use of nuclear weapons in this region. At present, the use of these weapons anywhere threatens world war, which can destroy all mankind and other life on earth. (?Former U.S. President Richard Nixon) mentioned this dire consequence in an interview with TIME magazine. General Bernard Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, stated frankly that a world war will very likely to sparked off in the Near East, Persian Gulf, or Indian Ocean.

Dear friends, you can see that the Iran-Iraq regional war is an excellent opportunity for those who want to begin a world war.

Since the very first days of the Iran-Iraq war, the Soviet Union has been striving to end the differences between the two Islamic countries through peaceful means and dialogue. This Soviet stand coincides with the aim of the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean nations; struggle to turn this area into a peace zone. Our country wants foreign military bases in this region to be removed and wants to prevent deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons for mass killing. The Soviet Union believes that the sovereignty of this area's nations and their policy of nonalignment should be respected.

LENINGRAD-SEATTLE TELEBRIDGE PROGRAM AIRED

LD210452 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 19 Feb 86

["Dialogue Through Space" telebridge program between Leningrad and Seattle, Washington; presented by Vladimir Posner on the Soviet side and Phil Donahue on the U.S. side; Donahue and American participants speakin English with superimposed Russian translation; date not given -- recorded]

[Excerpts] [Posner] Recently, in a TV center studio there gathered workers, scholars, artistes, veterans of the Great Patriotic War, students, writers, teachers from schools and higher educational establishments, and workers of the Leningrad Maritime Fleet. They came to meet viewers from the U.S. harbor town of Seattle, in the form of a telebridge. The Americans, who love strident headlines, called this event a summit meeting of ordinary citizens. We settled on a more modest, but more precise name in our view: A Dialogue Through Space.

Unlike previous broadcasts of this type, this telebridge did not have a previously agreed upon theme. The discussion was conducted as an open rostrum with the discussion of a broad range of questions. The talking was hard; the sides were by no means always in agreement. It was not easy to overcome the propagandist cliches implemented for decades in the consciousness of Americans. At times, it seemed to us, too, who had prepared for this telebridge, that it would take only a little more to push the Soviet participants beyond the bounds of restraint. Happily, the Leningraders' restraint was sufficient. The dialogue took place.

The Americans made their own version of the telebridge. It was shorter than ours. Our transatlantic colleagues felt it necessary to throw out the Soviet citizens' replies containing information about our constitutional guarantees and social achievements. Nor was a place found for talk about freedom of religion, in which two Leningrad priests took part. Now judge for yourselves about this unusual telebridge:

[Donahue] Good evening, Vladimir Posner. We greet you from Seattle, Washington. We see around you approximately 200 citizens, Leningrad residents, and we hope that you can see us, about 200 citizens from Seattle and its suburbs. It is with great pleasure that I bid you good evening from the United States.

[Posner] Good evening, Phil. Yes indeed, we have about 200 people with us. We can also see that you have -- well, it is difficult to count -- probably also about 200. We are very pleased to receive you in Leningrad. In general, meetings between a big number of Americans and Soviet citizens happen very rarely, although we are constantly in some way, in some sort of contact, but indirect, not direct. Perhaps it would be worth starting by trying to understand how we see each other. I would like to propose to you, Phil, to ask some of your audience how they see us, our country, and our people.

[Donahue] I will be happy to do that, and I hope that as soon as we end you will tell us what feelings you have about us.

[U.S. man in audience] My perception is that you are in general like us, that you are ruled by your government, like us. I would like to ask a question in this connection: It seems to me that people here are convinced that the Soviet Union is a class system. It is a communist society, but it has classes. Some people have more money and wealth than others. Is that so or not?

[Donahue] This man suggests that there are many classes in the Soviet Union?

[U.S. man] Two classes at least, the most powerful and rich, and the other part of the population is poor.

[Soviet woman in audience] In our country, the amount of money differs only depending on how a person works. On the other hand, I have a question to ask the man who asked that question. Does he feel that a person belongs to different classes only if he has a differing amount of money? In my view, classes are a far broader concept.

[U.S. man] I agree. I asked the question in order to try and clarify my own perception and the perception which exists in our country. Do you have a class system or not? We hear that under communism everyone is equal, everyone is treated equally. So my question is, are there any differences between people?

[Soviet woman] I, for example, personally, am part of the working class. I work as a tram driver. I have equal rights with every member of our society, in voting, in public life, and in meeting you, and it is truly all according to work. We do not have any differences at all; it all depends on the person himself.

[U.S. man] As you know, there are people in our government who allege that although your public statements favor peace, you still continue to build up your weapons. In particular, you are stationing SS-20, SS-24, and SS-25 missiles aimed not only at the United States, but also at Western Europe. I do not want to seem to be saying anything new, but it would not be correct, as I see it, to say that the United States is not displaying an interest in peace.

[Soviet woman] It is very nice, our dear friends of this evening, that you feel, just like us, that the measures to strengthen peace, to guarantee it, must be put into practice in the world. It is all the nicer that you consider the proposals our government put forward on a 50 percent reduction in weapons as your proposals. Obviously this is how our people think, and probably, this will help our governments to solve the problem that has arisen. It just seems to me that we have somewhat strayed from the topic of conversation of our meeting today. We met to get to know each other better. If we talk only about the high political matters that the leaders of our countries have already spoken of sufficiently clearly and precisely, as we see it, setting out their positions, then I am afraid that this will be simply, so to speak, an amateur repeat of the talk of professionals. Perhaps we have other themes to talk about so that we could really get closer to each other and understand each other better. [applause among Soviet studio audience]

[Donahue] In that connection, you should know that in the United States, there is skepticism in relation to the sincerity of the statements which you will make. Many Americans feel that you cannot speak openly from your soul, because you are afraid of punishment on the part of the Soviet Government authorities. There are even people in our country who feel that you will be threatened with a visit to a psychiatric hospital or even a prison. This does not mean that all Americans believe that. I must say that you are honorable people, and the Americans believe that. I simply want to share sincerely with you the perception that Americans have of life in the Soviet Union -- that you cannot express your thoughts freely. [laughter in Soviet audience]

[Donahue] Can you speak openly without fear of punishment?

[Soviet man] My name is Lev Yakovlev, and I am a teacher. Everyone here laughed when you said that we may end up in a psychiatric hospital for this. No, this is stupid, of course.

We always express our thoughts with total freedom [otdacha], and we always listen to our government with pleasure, and we support it. Why? Because no Soviet person wants war, and our Soviet Government is struggling to ensure that there never is a war, for peace all over the world. Our proposals -- why does the United States not reply to our proposals for a moratorium on nuclear tests? They recently again exploded a new atomic bomb.

For a long time you were told that the Soviet Union was behind an iron curtain. Now your view, and the view of our U.S. colleagues about the Soviet Union is completely distorted. Probably each one of us has experienced an awkward feeling, in general, because how can we prove to you that we are right? That there are no people from the KGB standing here who will seize on our words and put us into a psychiatric hospital or I do not know where? Perhaps that is a practice is some other country that you know well. We do not have that here.

[U.S. man] Well, if that is the case, then I would like to ask this person who has just spoken, what is the city of Gorkiy, what is that city, in general, used for now?

[Donahue] Try to be more specific. [sentence not translated] This man wants to say that Gorkiy is a city where critics of the Soviet system are exiled, including Andrey Sakharov, who is not allowed to leave Gorkiy, although he has expressed the desire to visit Moscow. Why does the Soviet regime put its own citizens under house arrest in their own state solely because they says things that the government does not agree with?

[Soviet man] Unlike the United States, in the Soviet Union there is a law banning propaganda for war and the instilling of hatred of other peoples. Our line since the year '17 has been peace and friendship with all peoples; but Sakharov has appealed even to you, the United States, to make war with us. He comes out against the people, and, expressing the will of the people, the government has sent him to a city where there are no foreign consulates which have established links with him in order to use him for anti-Soviet propaganda, against me. I support this government policy. [applause among Soviet audience]

[Donahue] Excuse me, but the man wanted to know how you express your dissent in the Soviet Union. This audience highly appreciates how your country rose from the ashes after the destruction of WWII. Please understand, we are not preaching to you. We sincerely want to know how the will of the people can be known to the government if dissent is suppressed and punished.

[Soviet man] I can answer that question in the way I see it. I think that some people will not agree with it, but the thing is that most probably with us, it is local matters that affect us most closely. Criticism is very widespread among us about what our municipality here does. We have many letters sent to the papers. We have many letters sent to our deputies, and they are obliged to reply to these letters within a set time limit. If anyone persecutes anyone for such criticism, this is prosecuted by law. There is such a law, and I think that this is a good manifestation of our democracy in action. Well, I think that there are, of course, dissenters among us. Presently we have a very great fight against drunkenness, and I think that many drunkards are not very much in agreement with government policy! [laughter in audience]

[Donahue in only English] Just a moment, Vladimir.

[U.S. man] I would like to agree with the woman who said that we are ordinary people. But as ordinary people, we get the impression of a lack of freedom of movement. Can you leave your country, if you want to move to another country?

[Posner] As a man who has moved both over there and over here, and incidentally who has lived in the United States, I would like to reply to that question: Yes, you can leave. There are certain articles both in Soviet laws and in the Constitution. A person can leave the Soviet Union. There is a set procedure: You present documents for leaving the Soviet Union. Just the same if you want to come and live here with us, you would have to present us with a special request for this, and we would study this request, because then we would have to give you both a flat and a job and supply you, and perhaps we would not want to.

[U.S. man] Yes, but I do not know whether you fully appreciate the passion with which millions of Americans view the restricted nature of the life of the Soviet people. Indeed, in some cases it is of a purely internal nature, and in many other cases it is a profoundly personal question for thousands of people all over the world who are separated from their loved ones through what they perceive as a forcible, authoritarian policy. In their view, it is often whim that prevents people who love each other from being united. This especially relates to persons of Jewish nationality in the United States, who feel that thousands of Jews cannot leave the Soviet Union only because they are Jews, or because of some sort of groundless claims by the Soviet authorities.

[Posner] Phil, that was not so much a question as a statement, which all the same I would like to answer, and say the following: You assume that there are only unhappy people in our country, 277 million of them. You say that Soviet Jews cannot leave precisely because they are Jews. Just take a look at emigration. Basically, it is precisely Jews who emigrate, and not the others. One would like to know from where you get this passion regarding to our country.

[Donahue] Why do 250,000 Jews want to emigrate from the Soviet Union?

[Posner] Where do you get that figure from? Have you carried out a referendum here or something? [laughter in audience] Allow us to know better how many of us want to leave; or I will tell you now that 250,000 American Indians want to come to us -- surely you will not believe me? [applause in audience]

[Donahue] No, no, please let me make my point. Over 250,000 Jews emigrated in the seventies, while in 1980 there were less than 1,000, so we can draw a conclusion that the number of those who left has been considerably reduced in 1980 and 1981 because the government prohibited the free movement of Jewish citizens from the Soviet Union to Israel and other countries. This upsets millions of Americans.

[Soviet man] I want to reply to show the fairly crude logic with which you formulate your assumption. Let us put it this way: Americans who were born in 1850 all ate gherkins and they all died, that means that gherkins are poisonous. In exactly the same way you talk of Jews; if the number of those leaving has reduced, this does not mean that they are being restricted. Perhaps it is simply that the number who wanted to leave have gone down. Have you not thought of that?

[Donahue] Allow me to briefly show you another example of the right which is most precious and loved by us, the right to free speech. Outside our studio there are people gathered who are protesting. What you are seeing is U.S. freedom of speech in action. These people are gathered here because they are displeased with me. They are angry with our station and this program. They believe that they should also have access to this program in order to express their displeasure over human rights violations in your country, in relation to which, as they allege, there is proof. [video shows people walking in a circle outside the studio carrying banners with the following slogans written on them: Stop Baltic genocide, Stop Soviet oppression, Ask an Afghan about Soviet peace, USSR stop killing the Balts, Free Ida Nudel.]

The leading newspaper in our city also condemned our program and said that our audience is specially selected, as is yours.

[Soviet man] It was very interesting to watch the demonstration protesting against our friendly conversation; and there were children in it. What do they understand? Does it not seem to you that someone is paying them for this work? I have a question to you Americans. Why do you bring out such films as "Red Dawn," other films which show Soviet people as barbarians attacking the United States? War is propagandized in your country; hatred for us is instilled, and we see this in your not very tactful questions. Why do you allow this? Surely you do not believe what you yourselves are creating? We had 1,710 towns destroyed. In Leningrad alone [attempt from Seattle to interrupt] Listen! In Leningrad alone we had as many people buried during the war as the whole number the United States lost. We do not want war. You know that! But someone among you finds it beneficial to conduct propaganda against us, and you make children demonstrate. Answer, why is it like that for you? Who benefits from it?

[Donahue] Does anyone want to reply?

[U.S. man] It is to your benefit, as we see it. We believe that every person should be free and freely express his point of view. We know that the U.S. Government acts wrongly in many cases. What worries me in the discussion with the people of Leningrad is the conviction which comes over that the Soviet Government is right, always right.

[Soviet woman] We elect our government to carry out our will, and I do not understand how I can disagree with a person who is doing what I want. If I ask someone to do something and he does it, I cannot be in disagreement with this.

[U.S. man] Would you be able to disagree with your military policy in Afghanistan?

[Soviet man] Why should we come out against the policy of our government in Afghanistan when our troops are there at the request of the legitimate Afghan Government? Our government has declared more than once: Stop interfering in the affairs of Afghanistan, and the small Soviet contingent of troops will immediately leave there.

[U.S. man] Greetings to the Russian people. I came here because I was invited as a fisherman from Alaska, where I have met Soviet fishermen. I would like there to be less politics in our talk here, so that we can simply get to know each other. I think we started incorrectly, started badly. I would not have come here if I knew that it would be just politics here. I want to know more about you Russian people. [applause]

Surely you can see that you are being provoked. I do not like it. I wanted to sit down with you, get to know you and talk. [applause]

[Soviet man] This fisherman from the United States has simply taken the words from my mouth. I would just like to say, what is all this? I just want to leave. I came here thinking that I would learn something new, interesting, and that they would learn something interesting about us. Nothing of the sort. You, gentlemen, are talking about what you know better than us, so it appears, do you see? You know better than us about it.

[U.S. woman] May I ask you how you see Americans? Not our country's political institutions; what do you think of our life?

[Soviet woman] It seems to me that you are very nice people and we are nice people. We also only passionately want to be friends with you. We are stretching out our hand to you and we want a very great friendship and understanding, and trust, great, great trust. We are not enemies.

[U.S. woman] We believe that your information, for the most part, comes from your government and is subject to censorship. In our country, we have the right to read what we want. We can go into a shop selling only foreign books and buy them. The problem is that not all citizens want to read them. This deficit of information is explained by the absence of initiative, of desire, but the information exists. The perception of your country is that the government edits the truth. The government gives you the news. Our government does not give us the news. It comes from private sources and they give us what they want. There are certain values in our country which are probably similar to your values, but we do not receive those values from your country. How can we meet each other more, as now, for example?

[U.S. man] I am a student at Washington State University. Indeed there are differences in our cultures. If we settle our differences, then we will better understand your culture and you our culture. Then perhaps we shall have peace and (?removal) of the nuclear threat.

[U.S. woman] A question for the priests in the audience. What is the religious situation in your country? Does the government take a part in it? In what way?

[Soviet priest] Dear brothers and sisters in the United States in Seattle: A great deal has been said today, and many of your concerns are incomprehensible to this audience, because you are speaking another language, because you, of course, are weighed down by a certain propaganda which I myself have observed when I was in the United States. Our society is not a frozen and perfect society which has already become encapsulated, so to speak. It is a dynamic society. It is in a state of quest. It is in a state of movement. Today, as never before, it does not fear to talk about the difficulties and problems facing it. There are problems. We are living people, people who can make mistakes, people who make mistakes and have made mistakes; and these mistakes should be changed. You have touched on the problem of the relationship of the church with the state. This is a very broad problem, but now it does not represent a problem. In order to confirm the correctness of my words, I want to quote the most basic document of the lawmakers of our country, the Constitution. I would like to point out to you the difference that existed in the Constitution of 1936 which spoke of freedom of conscience and the Constitution which was adopted in 1977, which also deals with questions of religion. In the former edition, it said that every Soviet citizen enjoys freedom of conscience. In the new edition, it says that the Soviet state guarantees every citizen not only freedom of conscience, but also freedom of exercise of religion. I think that you can sense the difference between simple freedom of conscience and freedom of religion. As well as this, there is also what I see as an extremely important note, which forbids the kindling of any quarrels, any enmity on religious grounds. So, I think that best of all is always to have an example as evidence. I have quoted you only one example of our movement.

[U.S. woman] I want to return to the question of freedom of conscience. I know that Article 53 of your Constitution guarantees freedom to exercise religion for all your people. But training of rabbis is forbidden in your country. The only rabbis there are appointed by the government and put into the synagogue, one rabbi for each city, while in Moscow alone at one time there were 500-600 rabbis. I would like more details about this question of freedom of exercise of religion. Also, I understand, that if a person wants to emigrate, to leave, for example, for Israel, he is put under house arrest, is sacked form his job, and deprived of all civil rights.

[Donahue] Perhaps the worship servers [English: religious fathers] will answer that question?

[Soviet priest] First I would like to say there was a mistake: It is not Article 53 but 52. [laughter in audience]. If a question is asked, it must be qualified. But perhaps I have the right, in some way, to reply to this question. Next door to the Nikolskiy Cathedral where I am a dean [nastoyatel] there is a synagogue, and I am personally acquainted with the rabbi. He quite freely preaches, just as I do. In Moscow, they have the opportunity to train rabbis. But this is what I would like to say: Our task now is to destroy the image of the enemy, and I think that these cliches they are trying to put on us presently are precisely the fruit of those models that were formed in the very hardest time, when there were no friendly relations between our countries. I have been in the United States. I liked the Christians and the Catholics and the Jews and everyone. I see how in our society we are all friendly and one of the achievements of our society is that we are building a united family, where national minorities are equal, where people are equal from the point of view of faith, and I am proud of the fact that I belong to it, and I feel that my brother rabbi is also equal.

[Posner] I would like to reply all the same, Phil, to the question that was asked in addition, concerning the fact that someone who has applied to emigrate is sacked from his job and further is subjected to all sorts of nasty things. Let's put it this way: If an American publicly declares that he wants to emigrate to the Soviet Union, you must agree as an honest person that it will fare badly with him, and it will be against the law. It will go badly, because in your country, in the masses, they view ours as hostile, and he will be to some extent assessed as a traitor. It will not be good for him. In our country there will be exactly the same attitude towards a person who wants to emigrate to the United States. It is forbidden to sack him from his job; this must not be done; this is against the law. It sometimes happens, and it must not be allowed. But the emotional reaction exists, exactly as it would exist with you. And here it must be understood that we are people here, and patriots. [applause in audience]

[Donahue] It would also be said that Americans in this audience more than once during our exchange of views have talked about unpleasant things addressed to their own country. This does not mean that they are not loyal regarding the United States. For example, we have here a serviceman who is wearing a uniform as a sign of his protest against U.S. participation in the Vietnam war. Here we have a woman who speaks against "star wars", and another who spoke against our behavior in Nicaragua calling it wrong. Many Americans, of course, are uncomfortable. There are people who express themselves against their own country in front of a foreign audience. And yet, they have the opportunity to do this. It is very noticeable, Vladimir, that not a single one of your audience has said a single thing specifically against the foreign policy decisions of the Soviet Government. Do you agree with the position of the Soviet Government in connection with events in Poland. Do you agree with what the Soviet Government is doing in supporting the penetration by Vietnam of Cambodia? In other words, it appears that a blank check is being presented to the Soviet Government. Do what you want, and the whole state, the entire people, appears to agree with the decision.

[Soviet woman] I want to say that perhaps there is a lack of understanding on that question for us on the difference which we have in expressing our protest. If you disagree with something, what can you do? Go out on the streets, take a placard, walk about, have a spit, and that is it. For us, the methods of expression is completely different. Criticism and protest must always be constructive, there must be some other solution. There. In this connection, we can appeal to the appropriate authority, which will not spit on it, but will examine the question at issue and will adopt the appropriate decision. You want it to be the same for us as it is with you, i.e. that we should go out on the streets and shout something.

We simply have our own form of expressing our dissatisfaction, or, on the contrary, our agreement. If there is dissatisfaction it must be seen what must be done about it, the appropriate authorities must be appealed to and the question solved constructively.

[Another Soviet woman] I am replying to the question. The U.S. friends ask us why do we, in their view, avoid answering questions as to how we relate to the position in Afghanistan, in Poland. They enumerate other countries. I consider that all the people here do not think that they have to justify themselves for anything. Yes, we believe our government, and we state this completely calmly. We believe in the main thing. We know that it is precisely our government which has stated that it undertakes never to be the first to attack anyone. How can one not believe such a state and government? So, we accept the steps it takes. We do have problems, very many of them, both economic and social, etc. If you come to visit us, - we will bring you -- I work for Aeroflot -- then you will see for yourselves that we live not at all without clouds. Wherever I have flown, whatever country I have been in, whatever passengers I have carried, I have always felt that I am a person who can say that she is an enemy of no one. [applause in Soviet audience]

[U.S. woman] There recently have been incidents of international terrorism in Vienna and Rome. What you think of international terrorism? Are you afraid of it?

[Soviet man] Like all normal, healthy people, yes, we are afraid of terrorism. Yes, we are against terrorism correspondingly. I am a sailor in our country's commercial fleet, and I must say that terrorism has an international character. Besides that, terrorists attack Soviet ships, U.S. ships, and those of other countries in such straits, for example, as Malacca, off the coast of South America, or off the coast of Africa. We are against terrorism. This is perfectly obvious. As the captain of a Soviet vessel, I would like to take our country's cargo to U.S. ports and, naturally, cargo from the United States to our country's ports. This would improve our relations without question.

[U.S. man] I have this question: How do your people react to the South Korean aircraft which was shot down [sbit]. Do you believe that it was justified? Was it a spy plane or did it simply innocently stray from its route?

[Posner] Phil, I will permit myself to answer very briefly. It seems to me that the talk has gone along the lines we wanted it to, i.e. human relations. So I think I can answer for our audience in saying that yes, we are convinced that it was a spy plane, that it was a tragedy for those who died, who were pawns in a very terrible game. We very deeply regret this and we hope that the agreement signed between our countries, in particular in the sphere of flight in that area, will make a repeat of such an adventure impossible.

[Donahue] It must be said that the Americans see this as an excessive reaction, the destruction of a civilian aircraft (?in an age where) we can exactly determine what sort of aircraft it is. So we see this as evidence of a simplistic approach on the part of the military circles of the Soviet Union, which very much alarms Americans.

[Posner] Phil, I have already said that we deeply regret those who died, but the Americans, in order to understand, must have all the information, and not just part of it. I will permit myself to say that if a Soviet passenger aircraft, during a period of 4 hours, intruded to a depth of 40 miles, overflying the main U.S. defense points, did not respond to U.S. signals, did not land when U.S. military planes tried to force it to land, ignored all signals, did not enter contact, if the Soviet Union had not warned the United States that it was a passenger aircraft and so on, I fear that our plane would also perish in the same way. I fear that it is so.

[U.S. man] I have the following question: About 20 years ago, Nikita Khruskchev struck the table in the United Nations, saying to the West: We will bury you. Since that time there has been a certain paranoia in our country or fear because of that. This is my question: Is this paranoia or a justified fear?

[Pasner] Who wants to answer this question?

[Soviet man] I think that it is difficult to conduct even a telebridge through space in such a nervous accent, because I can remind you also of the so-called slip of the tongue by the President, when he, in testing the sound recording equipment, said that he will send, will give the order to bomb Moscow, to bomb the Soviet Union. So let us leave these slips of the tongue by big political figures. They are burdened with very great responsibility for their conscience. Today our meeting is one of ordinary people, it is a summit meeting of ordinary people, and let us be guided by the common sense of ordinary people.

[Donahue] May I ask you, Vladimir, what your feelings and thoughts are? What do you think about what has just happened?

[Posner] I have complex feelings about what has happened. I am very pleased with that. But what has happened shows very precisely how difficult we find it to converse. I do not want to sound lightweight, but in the musical My Fair Lady there is a bit where Professor Higgins, indignant with Eliza, says why cannot a woman be more like a man [in English, followed by Russian]. Here is a source of indignation. I feel that sometimes we demand of each other: Why are we not more alike? Why do you not act like me? This is not right. Today, it seems to me that if only we both understood this, that we are indeed different, that each of us has his own viewpoint, and that it is worth something, this will already be the first step, very small, OK, but a step toward understanding. And when we understand, then we shall no longer fear; there will be no paranoia and [we will have] a normal conversation. Understanding first and foremost -- that is how I feel about today's meeting. [applause from Soviet audience]

[Donahue] We do have prejudices about each other, and it affords me no joy to say that reports about your country in the West do indeed have a certain Western flavor. We do not receive varied information about you in the way we would like. It should also be said that your information media are not especially famous for presenting the West, including our President. We also want you to know that what goes on in your country is your business. We ask you to believe that for millions of Americans the banning of Solidarity in Poland is an authoritarian decision against the will of the people. They similarly react to the invasion [vtorzheniye] of Afghanistan. The difference is that we debate our foreign policy decisions and you do not. It is precisely that which bothers us. But nevertheless, we are very impressed by your successes since World War II. We have children that we want to raise. You have children. We understand that our dialogue will not solve all problems. We hope that this is the first swallow, that it is the begining of a series of exchanges that will allow us learn about each other, and in the final analysis, save our children. We thank you sincerely for holding this dialogue. [applause in audience]

[Posner] That was the note on which Phil Donahue wished to end. Why? Because Phil Donahue, a man who is known in his country as a liberal, had to bring out all his covering detachments [zaslony] so that the opponents of the telebridge in the United States, and there are such people, could not attack him, accusing him of being soft on the Russians.

Well, this is not the end. There has been a continuation, and in my view a very interesting one. The continuation lies here on this table. [video shows table in front of Posner littered with letters] These are letters from Americans, letters sent to me directly, letters sent to the station King Television in Seattle. These letters express two viewpoints. The first is that telebridges are essential, that it is a form of contact which is very necessary. The second, well, let me take a very typical letter and acquaint you with it. It was written by Dianne Barkley who lives in the small town of Sunny Vale California. This what she writes:

I was indignant. I watched the Dialogue Through Space, and I hoped that I would see conversations between Soviet citizens and American citizens. Instead of that I saw how the Soviet citizens were replying to the viewpoint of only one American, Phil Donahue. But after all, Phil Donahue said that he was expressing the views of millions of Americans. Evidently that is not entirely so. Yet, I would like to draw your attention to the questions that were raised, questions which at times may appear to us strange or even provocative to some. It must be understood that these are questions from the environment, where the Americans grew up. Remember the demonstration we were shown [video shows demonstration]. One of the placards read Stop genocide in the Baltic, i.e. in our Baltic states there is a full-blown physical annihilation of people. And there were children in it, and looking at it. Is it strange that when these children grow up they will have a idiosyncratic perception about our country? They will, unless there are contacts. That means there absolutely must be contacts, including telebridges, and then, I think, the Americans will reply to the question that was not answered during our telebridge, to wit, who benefits from it? Who benefits from enmity between our peoples? If you want to reply yourselves, to this and to other questions, please write to us, or you can write directly to the King Television station, Seattle. Here is the address. [video shows address in English and Russian, followed by address of Central TV in Moscow. The closing credits say that work in the program was done by journalists Valdimir Posner, Pavel Korchagin, and Sergey Skvortsov. As the credits roll, in the background is a smiling, waving cameraman. The final caption reads "USSR State Radio and TV", and underneath "documentary guild" King-5 TV. USA." 1986]

LOMEYKO CRITICIZES U.S. 'NEW GLOBALISM' POLICY

LD201511 Moscow TASS in English 1338 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 20 TASS -- "New globalism" is a policy of the U.S. Administration and its allies which is dangerous to international security, a briefing for Soviet and foreign newsmen at the press centre of the 27th Congress of the CPSU was told by Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the press department of the USSR Foreign Ministry. The essence of this policy is the claim to exclusive right to react by force to events in any region of the world, where the "vital interests" of the USA are allegedly concerned.

This policy is aimed at trying to undermine or remove governments of sovereign states unwelcome to the USA. It is based on the philosophy of hegemonism and superiority. This has manifested itself, in particular, in the intentionally attentive reception in Washington at the highest level granted to the chief of the UNITA gangs, in all-round support for anti-Nicaraguan "contras", Afghan counter-revolutionaries and threats against sovereign Libya.

This policy, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign ministry stressed, cannot but adversely affect Soviet-American relations, as it is conducive to a build-up of international tensions.

REPORT, COMMENT ON REAGAN'S VISIT TO GRENADA

President To Attend Ceremony

LD202054 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Feb 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The U.S. President today began his meeting with the heads of several island states in the Caribbean basin:

[Reporter A. Serikov identified by caption] An ordinary meeting, it seems, of which there are probably quite a few on official Washington's political calendar; ordinary, were it not for the place where it is being held -- Grenada -- that same tiny little island in the Caribbean where the Americans have already landed once, or more precisely, American soldiers. This was in October 1983. And now, just over 2 years later, the U.S. President's airplane has landed here on the same take-off and landing strip of the (Province) Airlines airport, whose construction by the Cubans was seen in Washington as a threat to U.S. security. But what they feared in the White House was not the airport, but the striking example of Grenada, which became independent in 1979 as a result of the victory of a national revolution. The U.S. landing force in Grenada in October 1983 unceremoniously trampled not only its national sovereignty, the occupants encroached on the achievements of the revolution. And what did they bring with them? Increasing impoverishment of the population, illiteracy, and crime.

It is reported that the U.S. President will attend the unveiling of a monument erected by the interventionists in honor of the liberation, as they say, of Grenada. We cannot show you what this monument looks like; we simply do not have a picture of it. But this is probably of no significance. However much sculptors and architects may try to ennoble their structure. whatever encomiums will be heard at its unveiling, what will remain in the memory of civilized mankind is this image of the liberator of Grenada: The image of an aggressor, the image of an international terrorist.

PRAVDA Comments

PM201131 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent V. Gan under general heading "Grenada: Shot Down Freedom": "Tour of Sites of Shame"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Feb -- The White House incumbent flies to Grenada 20 February. In the 4 hours R. Reagan will spend in this Caribbean state he will take part in the official ceremony to open the new airport in Point Salines and will talk with the governor of Grenada, P. Scoon, and Prime Minister H. Blaize, who seized power with the aid of U.S. bayonets. In addition the President will meet with the leaders of a number of East Caribbean states who in 1983 made a "request" to Washington, inspired by Washington itself, for armed intervention on the island.

The piratical U.S. attack on Grenada and the abolition of the democratic regime existing there plunged it into chaos. All basic economic programs have been repealed, including those for vocational training. Mass organizations have been disbanded and the trade unions have been deprived of their influence. The airport in Point Salines, whose construction was begun by the Cuban internationalist workers, has been completed by the Americans, the calculation being that it was possible instantly to transform it if necessary into a U.S. military base.

The violence against Grenada and its annexation with the aid of arms to the ranks of puppet states obedient to Washington is assessed in the corridors of power here as "an important frontier" in the United States' globalist-interventionist strategy. Alongside the reprisal against an inconvenient government, Washington sought to intimidate the liberation movements of Central America and support antipopular regimes. There was one further aim, which the U.S. peace council formulates as follows: "demonstrating that the United States has overcome the 'Vietnam syndrome,' that its armed forces are now prepared to establish the necessary regimes throughout the world." In other words, the intervention marked the practical running in of the "new globalism" now fashionable on the Potomac in accordance with which the United States is flagrantly arrogating the right to do whatever it wants.

The farce of the "triumph of freedom and democracy" which is being played out in Grenada cannot mislead anyone. Having done violence to an independent country, the United States has in reality suffered a moral and political defeat. The aggressor who is impudently trampling on international law and peoples' right to an independent, autonomous life has appeared to the whole world in all his unseemly shape.

True Aim of Visit Viewed

LD201814 Moscow TASS in English 1753 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 20 TASS -- President Reagan of the United States has arrived on an official visit in Grenada, an island state in the Caribbean that in October 1983 fell victim to armed aggression by the United States. The prime aim of Reagan's one-day visit -- he will conduct talks with the leaders of the puppet regime in Grenada and other "friendly" countries of the region -- is to step up the process of forming a military-political grouping in the Caribbean area. As planned by the White House and the Pentagon, this grouping should take over police functions in the region from the United States. It is indicative that the first thing the President did on arrival was to "bless" the airfield at Port Salines which, as specialists say, it is planned to use for military needs.

REAGAN STARTS NEW CAMPAIGN TO TOPPLE SANDINISTS

LD202106 Moscow TASS in English 2008 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 20 TASS -- President Reagan has started a new far-reaching campaign for the toppling of the Nicaraguan Government. This is how the UPI news agency has described the recent series of meetings between the U.S. President and leaders of the Congress. The purpose of this conditioning of the law-makers and the public is to ensure the early approval by the Congress of the administration's request to dramatically expand U.S. assistance to the terroristic gangs of the "contras" who are used as U.S. tools for overthrowing the lawful government of Nicaragua. The sum mentioned is 130 million dollars.

One cannot fail to notice the "revelations" of the deputy press secretary of the White House at a briefing for journalists which was fully devoted to Reagan's statement about the military aid to the "contras". Asking the question whether the purpose of the U.S. was the overthrowing of the Sandinista government, the deputy press secretary said that, frankly speaking, yes, it was. However, on second thoughts, he started a lengthy speech to the effect that the assistance to the "contras" (?would allegedly) persuade the Nicaraguan Government to sit down at the negotiations table with "representatives of the opposition" and get back to former freedoms in the country."

In its campaign of threats against Nicaragua the U.S. does not confine itself to words. The Pentagon has announced the Iowa battleship and missile frigate are sailing for the Atlantic coast of Central America where they are to take part in a naval exercise. Thus, the U.S. intends to expand the conflict with the help of the armed interference and subversive activities against the legitimate government of Nicaragua and to create a dangerous situation in the region, turning down at the same time any political settlement, including the one that was suggested by the "Contadora Group".

Mexico City, February 20 TASS -- Miguel De la Madrid, president of Mexico, has urged the U.S. Administration to stop the whipping up of tension in Central America and stressed the importance of a political settlement in the region on the basis of respect for the legitimate interests of [words indistinct].

Washington, February 20 TASS -- Oscar Arias Sanchez, recently elected president of Costa Rica, has strongly opposed the rendering by the U.S. of military assistance to the anti-Nicaraguan terrorists.

U.S. PREPARED FOR 'ARMED INTERFERENCE' IN HAITI

PM201407 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading "Tense Situation"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Feb -- The Washington Administration has elaborated plans for armed interference in Haiti's internal affairs and the shipment of U.S. troops to introduce "order" in that country if the situation is aggravated after the flight of dictator Duvalier. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL has reported this.

A few weeks before the "replacement" of Duvalier that Washington had planned, the newspaper points out, Richard Holwill, deputy assistant secretary of state for Caribbean countries, made a special tour of West European countries and in particular visited Paris. He informed the West European governments of the U.S. plans and tried to win their agreement to grant the dictator at least temporary refuge.

Washington, the newspaper points out, had promised Duvalier its aid. But the vigorous demonstrations by the progressive and democratic public of many countries against granting asylum to the fugitive dictator are obliging the White House to maneuver to conceal its close ties with the pro-U.S. regime that ruled in Haiti. The newspaper points out that Duvalier recently sent the White House a "protest note" in which he wrote that he had "expected much more from his old friends in Washington."

U.S. ANTI-LIBYA CAMPAIGN ASSUMING NEW PROPORTIONS

LD201637 Moscow TASS in English 1537 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 20 TASS -- TASS commentator Grigoriy Vasilyev writes:

A ranking official of the U.S. Department of State, Robert Oakley, speaking in the Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism, has reaffirmed again that Washington may take "military action" against Libya. The statement was made shortly after the Pentagon had announced that new big exercises would be held in direct proximity to Libyan shores in March this year.

Military provocations involving U.S. ships and combat aircraft have been staged in the Mediterranean incessantly ever since President Reagan launched malicious attacks on Libya at the end of last year, unfoundedly accusing it of being involved in the terrorist acts at the airports of Rome and Vienna. The Libyan leadership categorically denied those groundless accusations. Washington's stance and the U.S.-announced measures towards an economic blockade of the Jamahiriyah did not find support even among the USA's closest NATO allies, despite the pressure put on them. Nevertheless, the anti-Libyan campaign, fanned up by the U.S. Administration, not only continued unabated but also assumed new threatening proportions.

Washington, having announced the Middle East area which is located thousands of kilometres away from U.S. territory, to be a "sphere of U.S. vital interests", has assumed a certain "right to punish" sovereign Arab states and flagrantly to interfere in their internal affairs. The USA does not obviously like the independent course of the Libyan leadership which rejects the imperialist diktat and the attempts by the partners for the U.S.-Israeli strategic alliance at imposing capitulatory versions of a Middle East settlement upon the Arabs.

New hysterical threats coming from across the ocean indicate that Washington is stubbornly unwilling to reckon with the legitimate interests and rights of Arab states and is streering matters to a dangerous aggravation of the situation in the Middle East.

'DISCRIMINATORY' TRADE RESTRICTIONS CRITICIZED

LD202353 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1330 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, 20 Feb (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

Addressing the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, M. Baldrige, U.S. secretary of commerce, reported that in January of this year, the Washington administration extended by 1 year all the discriminatory measures that were being taken to control exports that had been introduced for "foreign policy reasons." According to the minister, the White House concluded that "retention of these restrictions would further the contribution to U.S. foreign policy."

In Washington, this "contribution" means the wide use of trade as a foreign policy lever to apply pressure on other countries in order to impose its own will on them. Critics of the trade "sanctions" and embargoes have pointed out on more than one occasion that the United States is the only country in the world resorting to the crude economic blackmailing of those states whose policies do not suit Washington. According to calculations made by the American Institute of World Economics, during the postwar period, the United States has had recourse to economic "sanctions" over 50 times in order to attain political goals. The latest such act was the White House decision to completely sever economic ties with Libya.

During the hearings, many legislators pointed to the flaw in the use of trade as an instrument of foreign policy. In particular, Republican Senator John Heinz declared that the United States "gains nothing from economic sanctions." A policy of this sort only damages the reputation of the United States as a reliable trading partner. A vivid example of this was, he said, the administration's attempts to hinder the construction of the oil pipeline from Siberia to Western Europe.

At the senators' request, M. Baldrige gave a detailed account of his trip to the Soviet Union last December. He noted that "the United States can benefit from an expansion of trade with the USSR."

According to the minister, U.S. businessmen show great interest in developing trade and economic ties with the Soviet Union. However, he made no mention of the serious obstacles standing in the way. One of them is the U.S. trade credit legislation, which discriminates against the USSR. Another is the U.S. authorities' stubborn refusal to grant the Soviet Union most favored nation status in trade, which would enable trade between the two countries to be substantially expanded. The American side still retains numerous harsh restrictions on the export to the USSR of a large class of goods, justifying this by "national security consideration." To judge from M. Baldrige's comments, Washington does not intend in the near future to take any steps to remove all these obstacles.

U.S. AID PROGRAM SERVES 'AGGRESSIVE' POLICIES

LD201837 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2350 GMT 19 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, 20 Feb (TASS) -- The Reagan administration has commenced an intensive campaign of working on the U.S. Congress with the aim of getting major new allocations approved for military-economic aid to foreign states. With this aim in mind, the heads of the State Department and the Pentagon were sent to Congress charged with the task of convincing the legislators of the need for such help primarily for the countries which follow Washington's aggressive policy.

Speaking in the Senate Budget Committee, U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz bluntly admitted that the Reagan administration is giving the kind of aid to foreign states which "secures the interests" of the United States. At the same time he gave unambiguously to understand that such "interests" consist in the implementation of the notorious "doctrine of neoglobalism," aimed at underminign the positions of the forces of peace and progress in various parts of the world.

Of the $16.2 billion planned for the coming fiscal year as military-economic aid, more than one third is being sent to the Near East, where the United States, along with its strategic ally Israel, is implementing a policy of aggression and blackmail against the independent Arab countries. "Our adherence to the alliance with Israel and to its security remains firm as a rock," the secretary of state said.

The statements by Shultz on other aspects of the "military-economic aid" program go to show that the administration means to step up the flow of arms to the very regions where the rise of the national liberation movements and the successes of the young independent states cause the greatest concern for the White House. Major new funds are being allocated to Pakistan, which serves as a bridgehead for conducting the piratical undeclared war against sovereign Afghanistan. Special emphasis is made on strengthening the reactionary regimes of Central America which Washington is using in military subversions against Nicaragua.

"The aid programs represent an important supplement to the guaranteeing of U.S. global interests," C. Weinberger, secretary of defense, stated in the House Foreign Affairs Committee. In his turn, Admiral W. Crow, chairman of the Chiefs of Staff committee, stressed that "military-economic aid" to U.S. allies of "strategic importance," and helps to a considerable extent in strengthening the "forward defense" of the United States. By such "defense", as is known, the United States understands the creation of new military bases and the expansion of existing ones in various parts of the world.

As is shown by the statements by representatives of the administration, the military-economic aid programs serve as a means for implementing Washington's aggressive designs against the states which conduct an independent political course and refuse to submit to U.S. dictates.

OPPOSITION TO 'TEAM SPIRIT' MANEUVERS REPORTED

DPRK, Indian Sources Cited

PM201509 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS reports: "Sinister Triangle"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 19 Feb -- The joint American-South Korean "Team Spirit" military maneuvers, held annually in the Far East, are evidence of the active knocking together of a trilateral militarist alliance between Washington, Tokyo, and Seoul, the newspaper MINJU CHOSON writes. Since 1982 Japanese military observers have attended these provocative maneuvers, the Pentagon's bases in Japan are increasingly used as transshipment and supply points, and operational communications are maintained with the command center of Japan's "Self-Defense Forces" in Tokyo. The facts show that the sinister military triangle linking the United States, Japan, and South Korea is becoming a reality.

Delhi, 19 Feb -- The Communist Party of India condemns the holding of the joint American-South Korean "Team Spirit" maneuvers, regarding them as a gross provocation against the DPRK and a serious factor in the destabilization of the situation in the Far East. This is stated in a statement issued here by N.K. Krishnan, secretary of the Communist Party of India National Council.

Korean Committee Objects

LD201218 Moscow TASS in English 1134 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Pyongyang, February 20 TASS -- The Committee on the Peaceful Reunification of the Homeland of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has demanded an end to the joint American-South Korean "Team Spirit-86" exercises. In its statement published here today the committee says that these provocative military games have aggravated the situation on the Korean peninsula and caused a halt in the dialogue between the North and South of the country. The committee urged the governments, political parties, public organizations and peoples of the world to condemn the actions of Washington and its partners and to support the demand of the Korean people for the withdrawal of American troops from the south of the country and for the country's peaceful reunification.

U.S. EXERCISES ON OKINAWA DRAW LOCAL PROTEST

LD210558 Moscow TASS in English 0534 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Tokyo, February 21 TASS -- The latest stepup in the U.S. military's exercises and gunnery practices on the Japanese island of Okinawa has drawn protests from the local people. Okinawa accounts for 75 percent of the U.S. military bases and facilities on the Japanese isles.

Recent days have seen practice shooting on Camp Hansen gunnery range on the island, which involved M-198 155-millimeter Howitzers capable of firing nuclear shells, while "Green-Berets" commando units have started landing exercises at a military air field in the central part of Okinawa.

According to reports from the island, massive protest rallies were held outside those practice ranges, with the demonstrators criticizing Japan's involvement in provocative maneuvers codenamed "Team Spirit '86", which are currently being staged on the Korean peninsula.

They linked escalating activities by the U.S. military in the region to the aggravation of the situation around the Philippines where the United States is preparing for armed interference.

JAPAN TO COOPERATE WITH U.S. IN ARMS DEVELOPMENT

LD210521 Moscow TASS in English 0504 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Tokyo, February 21 TASS -- Japan has expressed readiness to cooperate with the United States in developing newest kinds of arms, including weapons systems envisaged by the "star wars" program.

An official spokesman for the Japanese Foreign Ministry said during a parliamentary hearing that he sees no fundamental obstacles to such cooperation. He confirmed that the United States has been exempted from a ban proclaimed by Japan on the export of arms and military technology.

Thus Tokyo has voiced agreement for mechanisms to be established for exchanges in military-technology developments like those that have so far been maintained only between the United States and its NATO allies.

The local press has summed up the Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement as marking another step in Japan's preparations for joining the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" effort.

DRA ARMY POLITICAL CHIEF PRAISES USSR ASSISTANCE

PM201421 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Feb 86 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Lieutenant General M. Ya. Saddiqi, secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and chief of the Afghan Army Main Political Directorate: "In Labor and in Battle"]

[Text] It is no exaggeration to say that in our country the word "shuravi" -- "Soviet" -- is pronounced with special warmth and cordiality. It has become synonymous with such concepts as "comrade" and "friend." And that is only natural. After all, the historical friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Afghanistan have withstood the test of time and continue to develop successfully.

Remarkable evidence of our peoples' joint labor can be seen at every step in Democratic Afghanistan. There are the thousands of kilometers of highways laid across the deserts, the famous tunnel in the Salang Pass, power stations providing some 70 percent of the country's power capacities, new residential districts, large scale industrial and agricultural enterprises.

I recently visited Nangarhar Province. Here the Afghan public widely celebrated the 20th anniversary of the commissioning of the Jalalabad irrigation complex, built with technical and economic assistance from the Soviet Union. Celebrations took place in Jalalabad, during which the foundations were laid for a monument to Afghan-Soviet friendship.

Formerly, Afghans used to call the Jalalabad valley "dead." Stony steppes with occasional clumps of camel thorn stretched to the horizon. To irrigate, that is, to bring to life this potentially abundant subtropical region where several harvests a year can be grown, was beyond the powers of the Afghans themselves. In the early sixties the Soviet Union extended a helping hand to us. In 3 years -- 1962-1965 -- with the help of Soviet specialists, reservoirs with a capacity of 40 million cubic meters, a main canal 70 km long, and the Daruntah hydroelectric power station were built. An irrigation network with an area of more than 24,000 hectares forms a mighty system giving the valley life.

Today, Abdul Ikhlas, director of the Jalalabad irrigation complex, recounts, there are four plantations of citrus and olive trees and three livestock farms on the irrigated land. In past years the complex has produced 54,000 tons of citrus fruits, 14,000 tons of olives, and a great deal of meat, milk, and other agricultural produce. The director of the complex spoke with great warmth of Soviet engineers and hydrologists Yu. Petrenko, Z. Mikhaylov, and others who work shoulder to shoulder with the Afghans at the complex.

Gangs of dushmans have tried repeatedly to block the complex and destroy it. They have carried out rocket shellings and shot at the workers. But the Afghan border guards, as well as workers and employees who have formed detachments of defenders of the revolution, have been able to protect the projects from total destruction. Soviet subunits from the limited contingent give the Afghan border guards invaluable assistance in rebuffing raids by gangs penetrating the Jalalabad valley from Pakistan.

The Jalalabad irrigation complex is only one example of Soviet-Afghan cooperation, which already has a history of more than 60 years. The foundations of the firm, equal relations between the peoples of the Land of the Soviets and Afghanistan were laid by V.I. Lenin, founder of the world's first socialist state.

In connection with the signing of the Soviet-Afghan Friendship Treaty in 1921, the leader of the world proletariat noted: "We are confident that our most sincere desire will be fulfilled and that Russia will always remain the first friend of the High Afghan State, for the good of both peoples."

A new stage in Soviet-Afghan relations set in after the victory of the April Revolution in 1978. After the revolution the traditional friendly relations developed into relations of fraternity and international solidarity. An important milestone along the patch of strengtheningthese relations was the new Treaty on Friendship, Good-Neighborliness, and Cooperation of 5 December 1978. Soviet people's sincere desire to help the Afghan people establish a new life has its concrete embodiment in the numerous national economic projects which have been or are being built with Soviet assistance. Among the biggest are the Kabul house building combine, the hydroelectric power station at Naghlu with a capacity of 100,000 kilowatts, the nitrogen fertilizer plant at Mazar-e Sharif, the gasfields in the Sheberghan region, and the famous Aynak copper field -- in all, more than 200 enterprises and projects, more than half of which have already been fully commissioned. They cement the foundations of the independent Afghan economy and strengthen its social base. Our countries' ties are also developing successfully in other spheres -- health care, education, and culture.

It is with a sense of particular recognition and gratitude that we speak of the unparalleled assistance which the Soviet internationalist servicemen give to the Afghan people. "In our most difficult times," B. Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council, has noted, "the heroic sons of the Soviet Union came to help Afghanistan's people uphold the country's independence and integrity and defend the April Revolution. The Afghan people and their future generations will never forget the Soviet servicemen's selfless assistance."

Under the direct leadership of the PDPA Central Committee and thanks to the help and combat experience of Soviet servicemen, the combat might of the DRA Armed Forces is growing stronger daily. The DRA Armed Forces, it was noted at the 16th PDPA Central Committee Plenum, are the decisive force in the attainment of victory over the counterrevolution. Crushing defeats have recently been inflicted on dushman gangs in Qandahar, Laghman, Herat, and Nangarhar Provinces and Khowst district.

A harmonious structure of the party political apparatus has now become established in our army. Its basis is the nearly 7,000-strong detachment of political worker officers, many of whom have been trained at higher military political schools in the Soviet Union. Party membership among all categories of servicemen is steadily increasing. Some 85 percent of companies and batteries have party organizations. The political consciousness of Afghan servicemen is growing. They are acquiring an increasingly staunch mastery of military skill and displaying it actually on the battlefield. High moral and political qualities are cultivated in them on the basis of concrete examples of heroism, military comradeship, and indissoluble combat friendship with Soviet servicemen.

There are many such examples. In one bloody battle in the Panjsher Valley, the dushmans managed to blockade a subunit of Afghan paratroopers. Their strength was ebbing with every hour; the ammunition had run out. A Soviet parachute company headed by Guards Captain V. Yuryev arrived in time to help the surrounded Afghan servicemen. Landing from helicopters, the Soviet servicemen drove the dushmans off the dominating heights and freed the Afghan subunit. For this heroic international feat Guards Capt V. Yuryev, holder of two orders of the Red Star, was awarded a high Afghan award -- the Order of the Red Banner.

The crew of a Soviet Mi-6 helicopter commanded by Captain V. Vasilyev has carried out hundreds of flights in Afghan skies carrying various loads. On one trip the Soviet helicopter was shot down by a bandit missile. The airmen were able to parachute out of the burning machine. Afghan helicoptermen headed by Senior Lieutenant Abdul Takhyr came to the assistance of the Soviet airmen, who had landed on territory controlled by dushmans. Sr Lt Takhyr landed his helicopter under fire three times, until all the Soviet helicoptermen had been ferried to his airfield.

"A friend in need is a friend indeed," the saying goes. However hard the foreign disinformation experts may try, they cannot discredit the Soviet Union's selfless international assistance to the Afghan people, who are following the path of important socioeconomic transformations. In selfless labor and in the staunch struggle against the counterrevolution, the indissoluble friendship and fraternity of our countries and peoples -- the most important factor for the attainment of eventual victory over the dark forces of counterrevolution -- matures and strengthens.

DRA MINISTER LAUDS GOVERNMENT'S BROADER BASE

PM201655 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 19 Feb 86 p 3

[Article by TASS correspondent S. Alayev written specially for SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA: "Measures by the DRA Government"]

[Text] Kabul -- New measures by the Afghan Government to expand the social base of revolutionary power and enlist prominent representatives of various social strata and DRA nationalities and tribes into the country's leadership, as members of the government and Revolutionary Council, have received ardent approval and support from the Afghan working people, stated Sarjan Khan Zazay, who recently became one of the nonparty members of the Republic's Council of Ministers.

These measures were preceded by important events in the country's affairs: the Loya Jirga (Supreme Council of the DRA) and the Supreme Jirga of Border Tribes, the minister said. For the Afghan people the Jirgas are a historical form of discussing vitally important local and nationwide problems. The historic decisions of the Supreme Jirga of Border Tribes, where the leaders and elders of the Pushtuns and Baluchis living on both sides of the Afghan-Pakistani border pledged to henceforth not permit the transformation of their territory into a springboard for aggression against the DRA, produced a major response in the country and abroad.

The practical realization of these decisions by the tribes irritated Islamabad, which blockaded the Khyber Pass mountain region with regular troops on a farfetched pretext. The Afghan people have ardently supported the just struggle of the Pushtuns for their national rights and for observing the traditional status of the zone of free tribes. Jirgas, whose participants are discussing the barbarous actions of the Pakistani troops in the Khyber Pass, are being held in various DRA provinces, particularly in regions bordering on Pakistan. At present, the minister stressed, there are preparations for tribal Jirgas in Paktia Province, including the territory of the settlement of the Zazay tribe, from which he springs.

Expanding the social base of the April Revolution, Sarjan Khan Zazay noted, has assisted in regulating the close interaction between the republic's state organs and the authoritative representatives of the tribes and nationalities of multinational Afghanistan.

POSTELECTION SITUATION IN PHILIPPINES VIEWED

LD211018 Moscow TASS in English 0618 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Manila, February 20 TASS -- The post-election situation in the Philippines remains complicated and tense, struggle is heightening between supporters of President Ferdinand Marcos and the Corazon Aquino-led opposition. Corazon Aquino refuses to collaborate with the ruling coalition, the Movement for a New Society, accusing the authorities on rigging the election returns. The opposition are trying to lend a national character to the "civil disobedience" campaign.

In Angeles, next to the Clark Air Base, one of the biggest Pentagon bases outside the United States, the leaders of the opposition held a meeting which drew scores of thousands people. Corazon Aquino has called upon her supporters to stage on February 26, the day after Ferdinand Marcos' inauguration, a nation-wide one-day strike, including a boycott of school classes, a boycott of state banks. Ferdinand Marcos urged the opposition to start a dialogue but meanwhile he will take steps to "prevent turmoil".

The local press points out that the United States which poses as a "peace-manner" unceremoniously interferes into internal affairs of the sovereign country. President Reagan's special representative Philip Habib continues his meetings with leaders of opposing groupings. To make Philip Habib's "mediatory" mission more "convincing" Washington sent to the Philippines the Enterprise aircraft carrier which entered the port of the U.S. Naval Base Subic Bay, accompanied by 11 ships and two submarines. According to the newspaper BULLETIN TODAY, up to 30 ships of the U.S. Seventh Fleet are to be present in the Philippine waters by the end of this month.

TRANSPORT, COMMUNICATIONS ACCORD SIGNED WITH SRV

OW300919 Hanoi VNA in English 0808 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Hanoi VNA Jan. 29 -- The 16th session of the working group on cooperation in the field of transport and communications under the Vietnam-U.S.S.R. inter-governmental committee on economic and technological cooperation closed here today. Nguyen Dinh Doan, deputy minister of transport and communications of Vietnam, and B.P. Trunov, deputy minister of merchant marine of the Soviet Union, signed the minutes of the session, under which new measures have been agreed upon to ensure timely transportation of the amount of goods exchanged between the two countries in 1986 which will be much bigger than in 1985. On the same day, Dong Sy Nguyen, alternate Political Bureau member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee, vice chairman of the Council of Ministers, minister of transport and communications, warmly received Deputy Minister B.P. Trunov.

CLOSER SOVIET, BURMESE COOPERATION URGED

BK181359 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 18 Feb 86

[(Viktor Klimov)commentary: "The 38th Anniversary of Soviet-Burmese Diplomatic Relations 18 February"]

[Text] On this historic day which signifies the importance of bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and Burma, we cannot help but remember General Aung San, the man who led Burma's fight for independence and initiated diplomatic relations between our two nations. We can still recall the general's remarks about the Soviet Union and his advice to the Burmese people to join hands and we advance together with those who support their just cause.

At the first conference of the AFPFL [Antifascist People's Freedom League], Gen Aung San said: We need to have friends. We cannot remain isolated. The Soviet Union is a big nation unrivaled today. It is not only the world's biggest political force, but also the only nation building a new (?culture) called socialism.

The Soviet Union was one of the first nations to extend its hand of friendship and recognize newly independent Burma; in the almost 40 years that follow, bilateral relations between our two nations have always been friendly. These relations are based on the principles of equality, noninterference in each other's affairs, and mutual benefit.

The history of relations between our two nations took a turn for the better when the Revolutionary Council assumed power in 1962. The Revolutionary Council initiated socioeconomic reforms with profound effects in accordance with the manifesto of the Burma Socialist Program Party [BSPP], and right from the very beginning it was the Soviet Union which showed understanding and welcomed the moves. The Soviet stand was founded on common interests and objectives in the struggles waged by socialist governments and nations for peace and social progress. The Soviet line to develop relations with Burma is a principled stand and not based on short-term interests.

In the international arena, the Soviet Union and Burma have either identical or common stands on many of today's most pressing world issues. This is particularly true regarding curbing the arms race, preventing the threat of nuclear war, opposing imperialism and neocolonialism, and bring about a new international economic order.

Many positive results have also been achieved in the relations between the two countries. There have been contacts between the CPSU and the BSPP and between the Supreme Soviet and the People's Assembly of Burma. The same is also true between the Soviet trade unions and the Burmese workers and peasants organizations.

Only in recent weeks, Soviet Komsomol and veterans delegations visited Burma, while Soviet artists and an acrobatic troupe from Georgia also staged performances in Burma.

However, it must be pointed out that not all of the potential for cooperation in the political, trade, economic, and cultural fields has been exploited. There is much room left. Based on the successes achieved and by making full use of the prospects, the Soviet and the Burmese peoples can advance along the path of mutually beneficial cooperation because it is in complete harmony with the interests of the two peoples.

The Soviet Union understands that not everything is running smoothly for Burma in its national construction tasks. Those elements opposed to Burma are taking advantage of the difficulties to divert Burma from advancing toward a socialist goal. But, the Burmese people are determined to march along their chosen path despite the difficulties and pressures from abroad. This was announced at the recent Fifth BSPP Congress.

The Soviet people wish the Burmese people new victories.

PPR'S MESSNER CONCLUDES VISIT; STATEMENT ISSUED

Addresses Factory Workers

LD202203 Warsaw PAP in English 2006 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Zbigniew Messner Speech at "Kalibr" Plant (Abridged) -- PAP headline]

[Text] Moscow, Feb 20 -- I would like to assure you, dear Soviet friends, that our country is and will remain a strong link of the socialist states community. The progress on the road to normalization of our internal socio-political and economic situation which was (?achieved in recent) years is the result of not only our own efforts, which strengthen the position of socialism in Poland. It became possible also thanks to the assistance of and tight cooperation with the Soviet Union. The supreme leadership of the Soviet Party and state assumed an attitude of full understanding for the difficult situation that our country had found itself in at the beginning of the eighties.

The cooperation between our Marxist-Leninist parties, their central committees was developed significantly. The frequent and regular personal contacts between the leaders of our parties, Wojciech Jaruzelski and Mikhail Gorbachev, have gained especially high rank. The decisions made in the course of these meetings serve the interests of our nations well. The "long-term programme of economic and scientific-technical cooperation between the Polish People's Republic and the Soviet Union till the year 2000," which was signed in [word indistinct] is an expression of the deepening cooperation.

The point is that NATO countries are increasingly frequently using economic weapons against the socialist community. We were faced with the need to meet this challenge. This calls for a decisive lifting of the technical level of our products and technologies. It is impossible, or at least much more difficult, to solve these problems by each country separately. In this situation we are (?integrating) our activities.

The policy of reorienting our economic relations towards the expansion of the economic, scientific, and technological cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist states has produced positive results. We expect them to grow in the years to come.

My official, friendly visit to the Soviet Union also served this goal. Our talks, first of all with CPSU CC Secretary General Mikhail Gorbachev, as well as with the chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov, and other members of the Soviet Government, passed in a friendly, (?sincere and) cordial atmosphere.

Successful implementation of the ambitious programmes of speeding up our countries' development is possible only in conditions of peace and international security. Our opponents from the capitalist camp, mainly the United States, are well aware of this. That is why they do all their best to disturb peace, keep up the sense of the threat of war. In order to attain this goal they increase international tension, wind up the spiral of armaments, especially nuclear ones, extending it to outer space.

There can be only one answer on our part: to close our ranks even tighter, consolidate the unity and cohesion of the community of socialist states.

Departs for Poland

LD201328 Moscow TASS in English 1319 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 20 TASS -- Zbigniew Messner, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, left here today. He stayed in our country on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

At the airport the guest was seen off by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Geydar Aliyev, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first vice chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

Joint Statement on Visit

PM201652 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

["Joint Statement on Z. Messner's Official Friendly Visit to the Soviet Union" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Z. Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, was in the Soviet Union 18-20 February 1986 on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The lofty Polish guest and the officials accompanying him were given a warm and cordial reception on Soviet soil.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Z. Messner, who conveyed greetings and best wishes to him from W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish State Council. For his part M.S. Gorbachev also conveyed best wishes to W. Jaruzelski. Fundamental questions of Soviet-Polish relations and the international situation were touched upon in the course of their conversation.

The Polish head of government visited the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and laid a wreath. A wreath was also laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin wall.

Z. Messner familiarized himself with the labor achievements of the collective of Moscow's "Kalibr" instrument-making plant and met with the enterprise's party and economic aktiv.

Talks which took place in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship, complete mutual understanding, and unity of views on all questions discussed were held between N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Z. Messner. The heads of government briefed each other on progress in the resolution of economic and sociopolitical development tasks in their countries and on the preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress and 10th PZPR Congress.

Both sides expressed satisfaction at the ongoing development of Soviet-Polish relations, which are based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, in accordance with the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and the Polish People's Republic.

The great significance of meetings and talks between M.S. Gorbachev and W. Jaruzelski for Soviet-Polish relations, whose further deepening and development is being ensured thanks to the leading role of the two countries' fraternal parties and the active support of their peoples, was stressed.

When examining questions of expanding and deepening economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, the sides expressed confidence that the implementation of the corresponding accords reached in coordinating the Soviet and Polish state plans for 1986-1990 and the transition to implementing large-scale long-term production sharing and specialization programs will promote the successful resolution of questions of the socioeconomic development of the USSR and the Polish People's Republic. Great attention was devoted to the task of expanding direct cooperation between the two countries' production enterprises and scientific research and other organizations, and to the question of creating joint Soviet-Polish enterprises and science-and-production associations.

Both sides stressed the desire to develop and deepen ties among labor collectives, trade union, youth and other public organizations, and friendship societies and to extend contacts among representatives of the intelligentsia. Great significance is attached to stepping up collaboration among war veterans, who do great work in the patriotic and international education of the young generations. Satisfaction was expressed with the growth of tourist exchanges.

The heads of government noted that the Comprehensive Program for Scientific and Technical Progress of the CEMA Countries Through the Year 2000, adopted at the 41st (Extraordinary) CEMA Session, is of fundamental significance for the further deepening of socialist economic integration. It was stressed that this program opens an important stage in the implementation of the tasks set at the Moscow CEMA economic summit conference. The program will promote the further growth of the national economic potential of the socialist community states and the safeguarding of their technological independence and invulnerability in the face of imperialist intrigues. The USSR and Poland will do everything possible to mobilize their scientific, technical, and production potential and to improve and enrich their economic collaboration in every way in order to successfully implement the program.

As a result of the talks the following documents were signed: a general agreement on cooperation in the creation of new production capacities and the completion of construction, modernization, and updating of existing enterprises in Poland; an agreement on cooperation in the construction of a nuclear power station in Poland with a total capacity of 4,000 megawatts; an agreement on the basic principles of the creation and activity of a joint Soviet-Polish enterprise for the production of potato products; an agreement on trade turnover and payments between the USSR and Poland for 1986-1990; a protocol on trade turnover and payments between the USSR and Poland in 1986; an agreement on economic and technical cooperation in the construction and modernization of industrial enterprises and other projects in Poland in 1986-1990; and certain other agreements.

The sides confirmed their resolve to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the socialist community countries by all means, to enhance the efficiency of their interaction within the framework of both the Warsaw Pact and CEMA, and to actively counter the attempts by imperialist circles to disunite [razobshchit] the socialist countries. Particular emphasis was placed on the importance and topicality of the fraternal countries' joint foreign policy program adopted at the Sofia Political Consultative Committee conference.

The heads of government declared that it is necessary to take advantage of the opportunities created as a result of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva in the struggle for a change for the better in world affairs. The USSR and the Polish People's Republic, like the other socialist community countries, advocate the practical solution of the cardinal task of our time -- to terminate the arms race, and primarily the nuclear arms race.

A radical solution to this problem was proposed in the detailed program, advanced in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 statement, for the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere by the year 2000 on condition that the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of strike space weapons are banned.

The termination of all nuclear tests would be an important practical measure in curbing the nuclear arms race. The sides again called on the United States to follow the USSR's example and impose a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. They advocate the speediest resumption of talks on the universal and total banning of nuclear weapon tests.

The USSR and the Polish People's Republic draw attention to the fact that the U.S. programs aimed at militarizing outer space and the involvement of Britain, the FRG, and other Western countries in these programs create a threat to strategic stability and international security and could lead to an uncontrollable stage of the arms race.

The heads of government voiced the conviction that it is possible and necessary to ban and eliminate such barbarous weapons of mass destruction as chemical weapons.

Attaching special significance to freeing the European Continent from nuclear weapons, the USSR and Poland believe that the total elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles, both ballistic and cruise missiles, in the European zone, with a simultaneous pledge by Britain and France not to build up their own corresponding nuclear arms, could be an exceptionally important initial step on this path.

Poland declared its support for the views advanced in the statement regarding the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe and the proposals aimed at settling the unresolved problems at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe.

Guided by the principles and provisions of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, and also the Helsinki Final Act, and by the corresponding bilateral treaties with the FRG, the Soviet Union and Poland resolutely condemn any attempts to cast doubt on the territorial and political realities which have taken shape in Europe as a result of World War II and postwar development. The sides condemn all manifestations and encouragement of revanchism, particularly in the FRG.

The sides voiced concern at the sharp exacerbation of the situation in the Mediterranean region and most resolutely condemned the hostile anti-Libyan campaign mounted by the United States and Israel, as well as the economic sanctions and demonstrative military threats against that sovereign Arab state.

The Soviet Union and Poland reaffirmed their immutable solidarity with the peoples defending their freedom, independence, and, national dignity against the encroachments of imperialism.

On behalf of the Polish Government Z. Messner conveyed to the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers an invitation to pay an official friendly visit to Poland at a time convenient for him. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

YUGOSLAV PARTY PLENUM DISCUSSES STATUTE CHANGES

PM201609 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 86 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: LCY Central Committee plenum"]

[Text] Belgrade, 15 Feb -- A routine LCY Central Committee plenum has been held here. It examined and approved a number of documents which will be submitted for discussion at the upcoming 13th LCY Congress. These included a report on the activity of the LCY and its Central Committee in the period between the party congresses and also proposals about changes in the LCY Statutes. It was resolved to submit the documents for public discussion.

Describing the documents presented to the plenum, D. Belovski said that in the past period overcoming difficulties in the economy, creating conditions for stable economic development, strengthening the unity of the party ranks, and enhancing its leading ideological and political role in the life of Yugoslav society had been among the main strategic thrusts of LCY activity. The "Long-Term Economic Stabilization Plan" had been adopted and is being implemented, a plan for the country's socioeconomic development for the next 5 years had been endorsed, and other measures outlined.

However, negative trends persist in many spheres of the economy. Inflation continues to grow. The intensification of regional isolation and violation of the unity of the domestic market are dangerous and disquieting. The LCY justifiably considers that united and effective action on the part of the whole of society are essential if the accumulated problems are to be solved.

ROMANIA'S CEAUSESCU NOTES TASKS FOR FOOD INDUSTRY

PM180920 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Topical Tasks"]

[Text] Bucharest, 15 Feb -- An enlarged plenum of the national council for agriculture, food industry, and forestry and water resources was held here. Its participants discussed last year's results of production activity in these sectors and tasks in increasing output quality and production efficiency.

Addressing the plenum, N. Ceausescu, RCP secretary general and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, touched upon the tasks facing the collectives of agriculture and food industry enterprises in increasing product output, improving its quality, introducing the achievements of scientific and technical progress more widely in agriculture, and further strengthening labor discipline. Dwelling on questions of international cooperation in agriculture, he emphasized that Romania will participate actively in the implementation of the program for socioeconomic development and the comprehensive program for CEMA countries' scientific and technical progress through the year 2000, which have been adopted by CEMA countries.

PORTUGUESE SUPPORT OF SDI 'PANDERING' TO U.S.

LD202337 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] A seminar organized by the leadership of the North Atlantic bloc is taking place in Lisbon. Our correspondent Viktor Anikin reports from the Portuguese capital.

[Anikin] The course of sessions at the seminar shows that its main task is to propagandize and advertise the U.S. Administration's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. Portugal's defense minister, Ribeiro de Almeida, has assumed the role of advocate and defender of space militarization, and declared the readiness of Portugal's Social Democratic government to -- I quote -- assist as far as possible in embodying the strategic initiative designs.

The progressive Portuguese press emphasizes that the United States, not especially needing Portuguese specialists for the materialization of the "star wars" designs, is striving to involve Portugal politically in this new adventure and, judging from official Lisbon's position at the NATO seminar, is succeeding in this. Indulging the militarist appetites of the Pentagon and the U.S. military-industrial complex, the Portuguese Social Democratic cabinet is taking upon itself grave responsibility for the future of the world. This is totally at variance with the interests of the Portuguese people, who are more actively participating in the struggle for peace and for transforming the Iberian Peninsula into a nuclear-free zone. The speeches in support of the "star wars" designs that can be heard in Lisbon at present reveal the short-sighted and dangerous nature of a policy of pandering to the nuclear ambitions of U.S. militarist circles.

USSR-UK COMMISSION URGES CLOSER COOPERATION

LD142331 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] The 13th session of the standing Soviet-British commission for cooperation in science, technology and trade was held in London. The parties have considered a wide range of issues. What are the prospects for the bilateral cooperation for the near future? (?Valeriy Zenko) writes:

The German poet Goethe once remarked that figures don't run the world, but they do show how the world is being run. Well, according to statistics trade between the Soviet Union and Britain in the past 5 years totalled about R9 billion; compared with the previous 5 years that was a growth of more than R1 billion. These may seem dry figures, but there's a lot behind them. Soviet foreign trade organizations and British firms concluded contracts for the supply of machines and industrial plant, notably for the Soviet oil and gas, chemical and automobile, food and engineering and iron and steel industries and also for agriculture. These contracts provided jobs for thousands of British workers.

The Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology concluded a number of agreements on cooperation with such British firms as Amtec, the Overseas Marketing Corporation, the Wellcome Foundation, Courtauls, Babcock International and Amersham. Much work was also accomplished by Soviet-British working groups for scientific and technical cooperation, notably in scientific instruments and automation, machine tool-making and medical equipment.

There's also another aspect to Soviet-British cooperation. British firms took an active part in international exhibitions in the Soviet Union, for example in the oil and gas exhibition and Plasmex, the plasma exhibition held in Moscow in December 1984. That was when a delegation of British businessmen visited the Soviet Union under Lord Jellicoe, the president of the British Overseas Trade Board, and in February last year Mrs Fenner, the parliamentary secretary at the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, came to Moscow to open a British agricultural exhibition.

A mutual exchange of information about scientific and technical innovation is proving fruitful to the economies of both countries, but notwithstanding the success of cooperation between our countries to date there are still considerable latent reserves that could give it a further boost. At the London meeting both sides expressed a readiness to expand trade and scientific and technical contacts. In this context they stressed the importance of the visit paid to Britain in December 1984 by a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet headed by Mikhail Gorbachev, which gave a fresh impetus to Soviet-British trade.

Talks are now underway between Soviet foreign trade organizations and British firms about further sales of machinery and plant and joint research projects in such areas as energy saving and rational utilization, flexible production systems, robots and electronics.

The meeting adopted a new program for expanding economic and industrial cooperation between the USSR and Great Britain in the years 1986 to 1990 inclusive. Undoubtedly this will contribute to the further growth of trade and economic contacts.

As might have been expected, not everyone in Britain is pleased with this turn of events. But despite propaganda blasts and undisguised pressure from across the ocean many British businessmen are firmly backing a development of trade between our countries. The Soviet Union, for its part, has more than once reaffirmed its readiness to cooperate on a mutually profitable basis. All sorts of sanctions and restrictions, such as those urged recently by the American Deputy Secretary of State John Whitehead boomeranged back, as the record shows, against their initiators. The future will show to what extent the potential for cooperation between our countries is (?to use).

ROME TRIAL PROSECUTOR CONTINUES SUMMATION

PM201613 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent G. Zafesov: "Along Slippery Path"]

[Text] Rome, 19 Feb -- The prosecutor's speech is continuing at the trial in the case of the attempted assassination of the pope in Rome. He has demanded life imprisonment for S. Celebi, the head of the Turkish community [zemlyachestvo] in the FRG. The prosecutor has admitted that Celebi is "an important figure who played an active role in the plot." There is evidence Celebi provided Agca with large sums of money.

But the prosecution's line is consistent only in that part which contains incontrovertible evidence. In the opinion of the Italian press, the prosecutor during his speech, which has been continuing for several days now, has "been demonstrating a general trust in Agca's evidence," in other words, We supports the so-called "Bulgarian version." It looks as though the position of the prosecution is becoming clear. On the one hand, it demonstrates a semblance of objectivity by demanding strict punishments for the Turkish neofascists, and on the other it tries to link them with Bulgarian citizens.

In the first case the prosecutor has more than enough evidence. As for Bulgarian citizens' involvement, the prosecution has nothing except Agca's slanderous statements. Nonetheless the prosecutor is persistently continuing to follow the "Bulgarian trial," despite the obvious facts and the requirements of elementary objectivity.

Prosecutor Marini is too experienced a lawyer to fail to understand all the groundlessness of the accusations against the Bulgarian citizens based on the statements of a "witness" who has frequently been caught lying during the trial. He also, of course, knows of the ancient postulate of jurisprudence to the effect that "one witness is no witness." What is compelling the prosecutor to embark on such a slippery path, casting doubt on his professional competence and reputation?

USSR-TURKEY COOPERATION COMMISSION HOLDS SESSION

LD182227 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] The eighth session of the mixed intergovernmental Soviet-Turkish Economic Cooperation Commission has ended its work in Ankara. Our correspondent Anatoliy Karitskiy reports:

The session approved a plan of joint measures by the two countries for the implementation of a long-term program, signed by the heads of government, to develop economic, trading, and scientific-technological cooperation between the USSR and Turkey. The sides noted how the flaghip of Turkish heavy industry, the Iskenderun metal plant, had been successfully brought up to design capacity; it was built and is operated with the aid of Soviet specialists. Mention was made of the fruitful work of Soviet specialists at Valiaga, one of the biggest oil-processing plants and at the Bandirma hydrogen perioxide plant which, in strict accordance with schedule, guarantees construction and assembly work progress.

One of the main events during the commission's work was the signing of a contract for the supply to Turkey of Soviet natural gas over a period of 25 years, starting from 1987.

The head of the Turkish delegation, finance and customs minister Ahmet Alptemocin, evaluating the results of the work of the eighth session of the commission said:

[Begin Alptemocin recording in Turkish, fading into Karitskiy's superimposed Russian translation] The work of our commission went off successfully, in a spirit of mutual understanding, and with the consideration of the interests of each. I am sure that its fruitful results meet the interests of the USSR and Turkey, and will play an important role in the cause of the further development of goodneighborly relations between our countries. The nationally famous economic observer Yaltin Daan notes in the leading newspaper CUMHURIYET the fundamental difference in the approaches of the Soviet Union and the United States toward Turkey in questions of trade and economic links. The mixed Soviet-Turkish commission session, the author writes, once again demonstrates the reliability of the USSR as a trading partner and its consideration of Turkey's national interests. This has made many people here pause to think on the diametrically opposite position of the United States on these very questions, which constantly violates the accords [dogovorennosti] achieved earlier, and which lead to sad consequences for the Turkish economy. [end recording]

FATAH OFFICIAL ARRIVES IN MOSCOW 20 FEB

JN211014 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0940 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 21 Feb (INA) -- Fatah Central Committee member Khalil al-Wazir, also known as Abu Jihad, arrived here last night on a visit to the Soviet Union lasting several days. He will hold talks with Soviet officials on developments in the Palestine question both locally and internationally, as well as Soviet-Palestinian relations and ways to develop them in the service of the Palestinian Arab people's objectives. An informed source here speculated that a senior PLO delegation will participate in the 27th CPSU Congress which will begin its meetings here next week.

LOSEV DISCUSSES MIDEAST WITH IRAQI AMBASSADOR

LD211035 Moscow TASS in English 1018 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 21 TASS -- Sergey Losev, a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet and TASS director-general today received the Iraqi ambassador to the Soviet Union Sa'd 'Abd al-Majid al-Faysal at his request.

In the course of their conversation the sides discussed some questions of the situation in the Middle East, in particular, those related to the escalation of the Iraq-Iran conflict. It was pointed out that the ending of that senseless war would meet the interests of the peoples of the two countries and contribute to ensuring international security in general. It was also noted that the imperialist forces were trying to exploit the further aggravation of the situation in the Gulf area as a pretext for outright intervention in the affairs of the countries in the region. The Soviet side stressed that the USSR is consistently assisting at the political diplomatic and every other level, including in the United Nations, the efforts aimed at an early peaceful settlement of the dangerous conflict.

COMMENTARIES STRESS NEED TO END IRAN-IRAQ WAR

NC202139 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 19 Feb 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met with his Iraqi counterpart Tariq 'Aziz on Monday 17 February. The Iraqi foreign minister went to Moscow at the request of the committee of seven set up by the Arab League to help end the Iran-Iraq war. During the talks it was pointed out that the conflict should be channeled toward a peaceful solution without delay, in accordance with generally recognized international norms. This serves not only the interests of the two warring sides, but also those of international security.

The unceasing Iran-Iraq war that is continuing for the sixth year has sacrificed about one million Iranians and Iraqis so far. Millions of people have had to leave their homes to seek safety from bombings and shellings. Immense material damage is being inflicted and farmlands are being turned into deserts. Both sides are spending billions of tomans and dinars each year to pay for the war. These amounts could have been used to achieve economic, healthcare, and educational progress. The war has halted many national development projects in both countries. The continuation of the war will lead to more human losses and material destruction and will further reduce and waste the economic and financial resources of both sides. All this clearly shows how senseless the continuation of this bloody war of attrition is as far as the national interests both of the Iranians and of the Iraqis are concerned.

On the other hand, imperialist and Zionist circles are overtly benefiting from this war. The fact that two large countries in Southwest Asia, both of which have a declared policy of anti-imperialism, are not playing an active part in the struggles against imperialism and international Zionism is to their full satisfaction. The continuing Iran-Iraq war is markedly damaging to the unity of the anti-imperialist forces in this region and creates a rift within their ranks. The Iran-Iraq war offers international and, primarily, U.S. imperialism a suitable pretext for the expansion of its military presence and particularly of its nuclear presence in the Persian Gulf and neighboring areas.

The White House and Pentagon speak of the need to safeguard free navigation and the uninterrupted flow of oil to the West. They prepare comprehensive plans for the so-called stabilization of the situation in this area. They resort to illegal and provocative acts such as the escorting of oil tankers and other vessels by U.S. warships, the patrolling of Persian Gulf airspace by U.S. planes, including aircraft with nuclear capability, and so on. The United States is expanding its existing military bases and building new ones in an effort to consolidate its military presence in the Persian Gulf. In parallel with this, the United States wants to force the Arab countries to request U.S. military and political assistance to resist a possible aggression allegedly stemming from Iran. In return, the United States seeks to use these countries' territories to deploy the RDF [Rapid Deployment Force] that has been formed to carry out U.S. interventionist operations in Southwest Asia.

As stated during Monday's talks between the Soviet and Iraqi foreign ministers, the imperialist forces which are interested in the further aggravation of the tension in this area should not be allowed to take advantage of the prolongation of the Iran-Iraq war. The Soviet Union, like all peace-loving countries in the world, absolutely supports the earliest possible termination of the Iran-Iraq war. Peaceful ways to end it should be sought, including recourse to the United Nations. War has never been an effective weapon for settling accounts with an enemy or for imposing one's political will on it. The termination of the Iran-Iraq war will end the many years of problems and deprivations faced by the Iranian and Iraqi peoples, and will release immense economic and human resources for the constructive objectives of social progress. The normalization of relations between the two neighboring countries will sharply reduce the possibility of intervention by foreign imperialist forces in the domestic affairs of Southwest Asian countries and will help to invigorate the general political atmosphere in this part of the world.

Israel, U.S. Benefit

NC141313 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 13 Feb 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The new CPSU program, published in the press for public debate, emphasizes the following points with regard to the party's view on the policy of peaceful coexistence: States should refrain from war, the use of force, or the threat to use force as a way to resolve differences; any differences should be cleared through negotiations; states should not interfere in the internal affairs of other nations; states should bear in mind each other's legal interests; the right of nations to independently determine their own destinies should be recognized; the national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the principle of the inviolability of borders should be strictly respected; states should cooperate on the basis of full equality of rights and mutual interest; and states should respectfully adhere to commitments stemming from recognized principles, the norms of international law, and existing international agreements. The new CPSU program points out that these fundamental pillars of international relations are reflected in the Soviet Union's Constitution.

These same principles form the nucleus of the Soviet approach to problems pertaining to every region of the world, including the Persian Gulf.

In a bid to ease the expolosive situation in the Persian Gulf, the Soviet Union put forward a series of concrete and realistic proposals in 1980. Acceptance of these proposals would guarantee independent, peaceful, and safe progress for the nations of this region. The Soviet Union proposed that foreign military bases not to be built in the Persian Gulf or on adjacent islands and that nuclear or other weapons for mass killing not be deployed in this area. The Soviet Union put forward an initiative on the nonuse of force against Persian Gulf states, including a prohibition against the threat to use force. It also proposed nonintervention in the domestic affairs of these countries, called for states to respect the principle of nonalignment which the Persian Gulf states have adopted, and proposed that these nations not be drawn into military pacts in which nuclear powers are also members. The Soviet Union's other proposals included respect for the sovereignty of these nations and their right to use their own natural resources, and the avoidance of creating any obstacle or threat to commerce or the use of sea routes linking this region with the rest of the world.

It should be noted, however, that in contrast to the proposals for peace and security propounded by the Soviet Union, the imperialist forces offer plans for aggression and diktat and the exacerbation of tensions to achieve their neocolonialist, expansionist objectives. The escalation of a U.S. military presence near the Persian Gulf, both at the Pentagon's numerous bases and in the form of constant patrolling by U.S. warships, continues. Neverending war cries are being heard from Washington on intervention in the affairs of this region, including those of Iran, under the pretext of defending U.S. vital interests. Several efforts have been made to form military pacts in this area with the participation of the United States.

Tension in the Persian Gulf, which imperialism is using as a pretext for its plots, is being maintained to a large extent by the Iran-Iraq war. This war of attrition has brought nothing but sorrow, blood, and destruction to both sides, benefiting only the enemies of this region's peoples. Zionist leaders clap their hands with joy when they hear reports on the continuation of the Gulf war.

In a speech at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, affiliated to the Georgetown University in Washington, Israeli Defense Minister Rabin said with blatant impudence: As long as this war continues, Israel is threatened by lesser dangers. Going into further detail, Rabin noted that Iraq's (?participation) in this [words indistinct] war weakens the front of Tel Aviv's hardline Arab opponents, creates a rift in their ranks, and might lead some Arab countries to separate agreements similar to that of Camp David. Israel also greatly benefits from the weakening of Iran. The logic of the Zionist war ministry chief is very simple: Let the Iranians and the Iraqis kill each other as much as possible. This will allow Israel to use less effort in pursuing a policy of aggression and expansionism against neighboring Arab countries.

Therefore, the policy of continuing the bloody Iran-Iraq war under spurious pretexts and slogans benefits only Israel and the United States. These two states intend to upset the solidarity of anti-imperialist forces in this region, weaken them through regional wars, and establish their diktat throughout the Near and Middle East.

Diverts Iranians' Attention

GF161016 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners, in the streets of Tehran which has a population of 10 million, one often sees funeral processions with soldiers dressed in navy uniforms leading the marches. Sad and mournful songs fill the air. Behind the coffin, the relatives of those martyred on the war fronts move slowly. Their faces are swollen from too many tears. They carry pictures of their brothers, husbands, and fathers. Women and children march. They have lost their fathers and husbands. In the Behesht-e Zahra cemetary, during burials, a water, which has been dyed red, is thrown over the graves of martyrs to symbolize those dead on the war fronts.

However, the blood of people is not water and the flow of blood cannot be closed like a water tap.

It has been more than 5 years since the start of the war between Iran and Iraq along the 1,200 km border and the flow of blood has not stopped. Even official figures, which without a doubt are less than real figures, indicate that more than 1 million Iranians and Iraqis have been killed in the war. For the most part, they are the cream of the crop, the hope and youth of the people. Who needs this situation? Who benefits from this bloodshed? It is quite obvious that neither the Iranians nor the Iraqis need this war.

It is also quite obvious that settlement of the dispute over territory, which was the official excuse for the start of the war, is quite possible at the negotiation table and by peaceful means. Is it really worthwhile for two people to kill one another over disputed territory -- to bomb towns, blow up oil terminals, and to sink ships?

Everyone knows that issues of territory have been left as an inheritance for Iran and Iraq by the imperialists. It was they who had a hand in fanning the flames of war between the two neighboring Islamic countries. They tried with all their might to sow the seeds of dissent among Iranians and Iraqis, who were good neighbors in the past. Yes, more than anyone else, it is the imperialists who need the war. They want to separate Iran and Iraq from the ranks of the nationalist freedom movement and they want to weaken the Nonaligned Movement, which has both countries as members. They also want to create more rifts within OPEC.

Dissent among OPEC members will allow the monopolizers to achieve their goals and to determine oil production and oil prices to their own liking, by tricks. Imperialists are using the Iran-Iraq war as an excuse for military interference in the affairs of the region and for having military provisions in the Persian Gulf.

The United States, by saying it is defending its own interests in the region, has deployed its aircraft carriers near the Iranian shores. Military maneuvers by the United States and its allies in NATO are held in this region. The RDF, which obeys the commands issued by Centcom on the other side of the ocean, are deployed here. Nuclear weapons are deployed at various U.S. military bases established in different areas of the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. We should also say that in the programs planned by the Pentagon, the use of these deadly weapons against Iran has been provided for.

Apart from all this, to whose benefit is the war between Iran and Iraq? Many analysts pay attention to the fact that the continuation of the Iran-Iraq war has been programmed in the long-term planning of certain circles in Iran. These circles want to turn the attention of the Iranian toilers from the serious internal problems and goals, and the determining duties that the anti-Shah revolution has brought up.

The Soviet Union wants the Iran-Iraq war to end immediatley and the issues of conflict between the two warring nations to be solved through negotiations.

During the 26th CPSU Congress, which was held in February 1981, the Soviet Union announced this quite frankly; now, before the opening of the 27th CPSU Congress, the position of our country has not changed. The UN Security Council, the World Peace Council, the Nonaligned Movement, the Asian and African Peoples Solidarity Organization and other progressive world and regional bodies invite the two sides to listen to logic and to end this meaningless bloodshed. Unfortunately, in Tehran they are still not listening to these calls.

The Val-Fajr-8 operations, which are going on these days, have left many new casualties and victims.

AL-'ATTAS ADDRESSES PDRY GOVERNMENT SESSION

PM201440 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Session Held"]

[Text] Aden, 19 Feb -- The first session of the new PDRY [People's Democratic Republic of Yemen] Council of Ministers has been held here. Haydar Abu Bakr al-'Attas, member of the Yemen Socialist Party Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the PDRY Supreme People's Council Presidium, who participated in the session, stressed the importance of preserving the progressive system in the country. He called for the strengthening of unity between party and people, organs of power and social organizations to be promoted in every possible way, for the supply of everything necessary to the population to be organized, and for a resolute struggle to be launched to reduce unproductive expenditure.

FURTHER COMMENT, REPORTAGE ON SITUATION IN CHAD

IZVESTIYA Notes U.S. Role

PM201522 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Unnamed own correspondent dispatch: "Operation 'Hawk' Continuing"]

[Excerpts] Paris -- Paris has christened the intervention operation that it is carrying out in Chad "Operation Hawk." Expanding the scale of military interference, France is becoming increasingly involved in the internal conflict in this country and is again taking on gendarme functions.

The United States is making no secret of its satisfaction with this intervention operation. Washington applauds Paris, a U.S. State Department spokesman stated, stressing that among the Western countries France plays the main role in giving aid and ensuring the security of the pro-Western Chadian regime. However, things are not restricted to applause alone. The United States holds constant "consultations" with Paris over the Chad problem, provides France with spy satellite intelligence information, and is expediting shipments of additional military aid to the tune of 6 million dollars to the Habre regime.

"We are following the events in Chad with great interest," General B. Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, stated in response to a question from this correspondent while speaking Tuesday at a meeting in Paris organized by the French International Relations Institute. "We are satisfied with the measures taken by the French Government," the general said, recalling that the U.S. 6th Fleet is currently on maneuvers off the Libyan coast. This "coincidence" clearly accords with Washington's calculations.

Military Force 'Bad Gamble'

PM201445 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Feb 86 Second Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov article: "'Hawks' Over Chad: A Bad Gamble"]

[Text] The French military again hold sway in Ndjamena, capital of Chad. In the air are French Jaguars and Mirages, and on the ground armored carriers and artillery. The city streets are patrolled by servicemen from the French "rapid action forces," which are preparing to be sent deep into the country to where the troops of H. Habre's pro-Western regime have unleashed combat operations against formations of the National Unity Transition Government (GUNT), headed by G. Oueddei.

The latest flareup in hostilities in Chad, which has been torn by civil war for 20 years, forms a barrier in the path of the efforts of the OAU to reconcile the warring Chadian groupings. The willingness with which France has once again intervened in the Chad conflict cannot but prompt the thought that it has a great interest in the continuation of the conflict. And the speed with which Paris started sending its troops into Chad, first from the former French colonies and then from France itself, is irrefutable evidence that Paris was ready for this turn of events.

Incidentally, even some French newspapers are pointing this out. Thus, in LE MONDE's opinion, the French intervention in Chad, which is taking place under the codename "Hawk," is a "deliberately planned act." And it was planned not only in Paris, but also in Washington.

After all, it can hardly be considered coincidental that the French troops went into Chad at a moment when American naval and air forces are carrying out provocative maneuvers off the Libyan coast and the American administration is stepping up the campaign of blackmail and threats against the Libyan Jamahiriyah.

Nobody can be misled by the fact that Paris, in sending its troops into Chad, claims that this is necessary in order to stabilize the situation in the country and establish peace. After all, it has happened before. This is not the first time that French troops have been sent into this African country. Every time, such intervention has only exacerbated the situation both in Chad itself, and throughout the central African region. The present armed interference by Paris will undoubtedly not help solve the acute domestic political conflict in Chad. It can only complicate the quest for a peaceful settlement.

That is why African capitals are expressing the most serious concern about the turn of events in the center of the continent. The leaders of the majority of independent African states demand decisively that all foreign troops be immediately withdrawn from Chad, and that priority in the quest for a settlement of the Chad conflict be given to peaceful means. The gamble on force is a bad gamble.

U.S. 'Servicemen' Sent

LD201623 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Excerpts] Reports from Chad indicate that tension is again running high in that central African country. First of all there is France's direct military interference in the internal conflict in Chad.

Official Paris claims that this is only a demonstration of strength. However, the bombing by French planes of regions under the control of one of the warring sides in Chad is regarded by observers as the direct use of force and not at all just a demonstration.

France's interventionist action in Chad is denounced by broad public circles in France and many of the African countries are likewise protesting against it. It is indicative that the United States hastened to contribute to the aggravation of the situation Chad. News agencies say that American military hardware and also American servicemen are being sent to the country. True, Washington says they are allegedly only instructors to teach men to handle the American weapons. But it would be well to recall that in Vietnam too everything started with sending instructors to that country.

ANGOLAN STATEMENT PROTESTS U.S. POLICY IN REGION

LD201908 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Luanda, February 20 TASS -- The Ministry of External Relations of Angola denounced the course steered by Washington and Pretoria, as a tense situation in southern Africa persists through their fault. According to the Angolan news agency ANGOP, heads of accredited diplomatic missions of several countries of the West were informed about the views of the People's Republic of Angola on the issue of settlement in the region.

A statement by Minister of External Relations of Angola Afonso Van Dunem puts the responsibility for growing tensions and the escalating aggression against the "Frontline" States, specifically Angola, on the Reagan administration and the South African racist regime.

The United States and South Africa, the document says, openly support anti-Angolan groupings. An example of hostile attitude of the United States to people's Angola is the recent welcome accorded by the Washington administration to Savimibi, the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] leader. Washington's support for the counter-revolutionary UNITA grouping, the statement says, is an instance of gross interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state.

The U.S. stand on South Africa is holding back a just solution of the Namibian question and exacerbates the suffering of the African majority in the R.S.A., the document stresses. The only lawful solution to the problems of southern Africa is possible solely on the basis of the relevant decisions of the United Nations, specifically, Resolution 435 of the Security Council.

SWAPO LEADER: CUBAN TROOPS, NAMIBIA NOT LINKED

PM201501 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 19 Feb 86 p 1

[TASS Report: "Just Demand"]

[Text] Lusaka, 18 Feb -- The decolonialization of Namibia has nothing in common with the question of the withdrawal of Cuban internationalists from the People's Republic of Angola, Sam Nujoma, president of the South-West African People's Organization [SWAPO] has stated here. He categorically repudiated the attempts by Pretoria and Washington to "link" the granting of independence to Namibia with the sovereign right of the People's Republic of Angola to turn for assistance to a friendly state under conditions of foreign aggression.

The SWAPO leader exposed the mendacity of Pretoria's assertions of its intention to work out a certain formula to solve the Namibian problem.

S. Nujoma demanded that the apartheid regime immediately fulfill UN Security Council Resolution 435 on Namibia.

SOVIET NAVAL SHIP CALLS IN GUINEA-BISSAU

PM201529 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Feb 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "On an Official Friendly Visit"]

[Text] Bissau, 19 Feb -- The capital of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau greeted with a salute of nations the large antisubmarine ship Soobrazitelnyy of the USSR Navy, which has arrived here on an official friendly visit.

During their stay in the country the Soviet seamen will meet with leaders of the Guinea-Bissau party and government, representatives of public organizations, and working people from Bissau and other cities in the Republic, and will take part in a state reception to mark the 68th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy.

The program for the visit includes the laying of wreaths at the Amilcar Cabral Mausoleum and the monument to national heroes who fell in the struggle for the freedom of the Guinean people.

CHILEAN COMMUNIST PARTY MANIFESTO FOR 1986

PY312353 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2130 GMT 28 Jan 86

["Text" of Chilean Communist Party Manifesto entitled "Let Us Make 1986 the Year of Victory"]

[Text] Countrymen: We can put an end to the dictatorship this year and it will be possible if together we adopt a combative position. This objective is one of the most fervent wishes of the Chilean people and a pressing need for the economic, social, political, and cultural development of the nation.

The rural and urban workers, shantytown dwellers, students and youth in general, professionals and technicians, writers and artists, craftsmen, and most industrial, agricultural, mining, construction, commerce, cargo transport, and mass transportation entrepreneurs see the end of the dictatorship as a chance to solve their own problems and those of the country.

The peoples' desire to put an end to the tyranny is expressed in a thousand ways, particularly by the massive demonstrations and is reflected in the actions of the political parties to one extent or another.

Gabriel Valdes, on behalf of his party and the Democratic Alliance, has expressed a desire to receive John Paul II in peace and liberty. The Democratic Popular Movement [MDF] supports that wish and stresses that its fulfillment is a commitment of honor for everyone, which the united opposition is no doubt capable of making come true. The Board of the Left [La Mesa de Izquierda] that is composed of the parties gathered under the umbrella of the MDP, the Socialist Bloc, and the Christian Left have made a call to make 1986 the year of the dictatorship's overthrow by means of a broad unity and intense social mobilization. The personalities that are grouped in the Democratic intransigence and those who last year signed the document entitled "No to 1989," also call for a prompt solution to the conflict between the people of Chile and the tyranny that oppresses them. Even in the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie there are many who believe the country has come to a critical situation that must be resolved without delay. The conviction that 1986 is a decisive year is widespread.

The Pinochet regime is worn out. Its basis of support is weak and precarious. It has lost almost all civilian support and in the armed forces the number of dissenters who favor the transfer of power to civilians is growing daily. This situation worsens the crisis of the dictatorship and demonstrates that the dictatorship is in a state of extreme isolation and enfeeblement that reveals significant changes in the correlation of forces.

Pinochet poses as patriot and nationalist and even proclaims that he is a vassal to no one. The facts, however, demonstrate that this is not so. Pinochet is at the service of foreign financial capital, not of Chile and the Chileans. He does as ordered by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which are institutions controlled by imperialism. To comply with these orders, Pinochet restricts the real earnings of workers and retirees, keeps 1 million people unemployed, refuses to solve the problem of 600,000 people who have small-and medium-size debts, sells state enterprises that are the heritage of all Chileans, and sticks to an economic policy favoring the imperialist multinational companies and a small group of native magnates. One of Pinochet's main concerns is to amass resources to service the foreign debt and to finance his repressive apparatus. But health, education, housing, and productive investments are areas of no concern to him.

The economic crisis has no solution with the tyranny. As long as it stays in power, the living conditions of the majority -- workers, middle class, small, medium, and even large property owners -- will keep getting worse.

The country is convinced of the need to end this state of affairs. People want to work for their own benefit and to have a government that gives priority to productive investments and the people's needs.

The workers want to recover the gains they had made and to have the real right to unionize, petition, and strike. The people demand their right of assembly, to freedom of expression and press, justice and work, health care and housing.

The Pinochet dictatorship came into being with bloody hands and stays in power by means of crime and terror. The terrible slaughter of Jose Manuel Parada, Manuel Guerrero, and Santiago Nattino showed in the eyes of everyone the degree of corruption, perversion, and insanity the tyranny has reached. The assassinations ordered by the tyrant and perpetrated during the ill-fated tour of General Arellano Stark through La Serena, Copiapo, Antofagasta, and Calama -- which only part of the population knew about at the time -- are now known by the entire nation, including the men in uniform.

At a time when the Gorbachev-Reagan summit in Geneva is being greeted by progressive mankind as a step toward a more wholesome international atmosphere and toward making future peace agreements easier, the messianic occupant of the La Moneda Palace proclaims to the four corners of the world that he is at war against the Soviet Union and communism. This war -- if it can be called a war -- is being waged by the tyrant who commands the armed forces, on orders from U.S. imperialism, against defenseless people, with a count of dead Chileans higher than that of the Pacific confrontation.

Chile says enough and moves closer to the people's rebellion. Most citizens wish to put an end to the terrorism imposed by the regime for more than 12 years. People want to end the torture, kidnappings, murders of opposition members, exiles, banishments, arbitrary detentions, brutal police deployments against shantytowns, attacks against churches and priests, attacks on defenseless women, and the gangs of armed civilians who move around and kill even in broad daylight.

The Communist Party is firmly resolved to oust the dictatorship in 1986 and promises to make its greatest effort to achieve this objective. Our party is not accustomed to making false promises, therefore we are not leading the people to think of illusions. Ousting the dictatorship in 1986 is not just a matter of rhetoric. We reaffirm that freedom has to be conquered, it is not a gift. To put an end to the dictatorship in 1986, we must confront it with courage, with the will to use all methods of struggle to achieve our objective. Revolutionary firmness and the combat actions strengthen the morale of the masses while they cause uncertainty, confusion, and even panic among the enemy. This firmness and these actions bring the defeat of the dictatorship and the triumph of democracy closer.

We are telling the people the truth. The last stages of the struggle against fascism will be hard and could be the most difficult ones from every point of view. The tyrant is willing to do anything; he may make use of state terrorism in the most beastly manner imaginable. He may even resort to fixed plebiscites and elections, a chosen congress or any other maneuver that will allow him to stay in power.

In turn, the intervention and purposes of Yankee imperialism are absolutely clear. It continues supporting Pinochet while at the same time strongly pressuring him.

Ambassador Harry Barnes works day and night to try to establish a doubtful settlement between the regime and part of the opposition to ensure the dictator's continuation until 1989, to save U.S. interests, and to leave room for at least a limited democratic system.

However, the people can and must defeat the maneuvers of imperialism and the tyrant. The most important thing is to force the main objective: the development of the struggle and the unity of action of all the progressive and democratic forces.

To achieve this we must mobilize the people's potential, its known forces and reserves. We must decidedly carry out the social mobilization and civil disobedience; we must make the country ungovernable; and we must organize the rebellion of the entire nation in the struggle for freedom and democracy.

We fully support the MDP proposal to the Democratic Alliance [AD] to define a common plan for social struggle and mobilization and to reach the necessary agreements on the character, basis, and tasks of a provincial democratic government after the dictatorship.

We Communists do not conceal our final objectives or immediate intentions. We struggle to install a progressive, democratic government that will become a transition to socialism after the tyranny is ousted. We believe that this objective fully meets the demands of social development as well as the needs and interests of the people and the country. However, if the dictatorship were to be followed by a not truly democratic, but a bourgeois-oriented regime, we would accept it with an open attitude, but always defending the people's rights and struggling for the broadest democratic principles and our main objectives.

The first and main thing is to overthrow the tyrant. Pinochet is an impediment that must be removed to open the way for a democratic way. To overthrow him is an urgent and undelayable task of the opposition forces and of all those who are concerned about our country's destiny. He must be tried and punished and his fascist constitution (which allows him to stay in power longer than 1989, to continue as commander in chief of the Army, and to become a senator for life without being elected) must be put in the trash can. This is why we permanently reject any transaction with the dictator. However, we would not oppose an agreement with the armed forces if it leads to overthrowing Pinochet and towards democracy.

The armed forces have a great responsibility. The manner in which the inevitable transition to democracy is developing will depend greatly on the behavior of the armed forces. As long as the armed forces continue to act as the regime's ruthless guardians, shooting at the defenseless population and supporting the repression, corruption, and crime, they will broaden the gap that separates them from the people. Officers, noncommissioned officers, the rank and file, and soldiers have the duty of rejecting their current role of being instruments of injustice and evilness.

The strength of the MDP and communists has been demonstrated clearly by the national protests, by the elections in the more than 20 universities, and by its multitudinous presence in the great O'Higgins Park meeting called by the AD. The results of these actions are very positive: They are a harsh blow to exclusionary and conciliatory positions and they likewise confirm and extend the conviction that the whole opposition must unite in order to overthrow the dictatorship.

ast December, Pinochet categorically rejected any dialogue or understanding with embers of the so-called National Accord for the Transition to Full Democracy. He id so in an overbearing manner to humiliate his opponents and he also demanded their nconditional submission, the abandonment of non-active violence, peaceful protests, nd social mobilization. After this, it is now more evident and necessary that all orces supporting democracy and freedom agree on the need to unite in this struggle.

t is time to put an end to the sufferings of the people who not only cry out to heaven n protest, but who, above everything else, demand from the political parties, social rganizations, each man, and each democratic leader an attitude of unity and combat s well as the firm decision to make 1986 the year of democracy's victory over fascism.

he dictatorship can be overthrown as a result of a constant, combative, and growing truggle by the masses. The key to victory is in the united mobilization of the people n all corners of our country, in the development of the self-defense of the masses, n the common action by Marxists and Christians, and in the agreement to struggle among ll the opposition forces, be they from the left, center, or right.

orward with the joint and decided action of the workers of each industry and service n favor of their immediate demands and the petitions made by the National Workers ommand [CNT] and the assembly of the National Council of Confederations, Associations, nd Trade Unions [CONFASIN]!

orward with the struggle of the slum dwellers for bread, housing, and health, for he democratization of city councils and against the raids and aggressions by repressive orces!

orward with the anti-dictatorial movement of the different sectors that compose the niversities and with the organization and struggle of the 680,000 high school students! n 1986, the people expect their struggle to reach the same level as that of the tudents.

orward with the struggle of the Mapuche nation and with the support for the social truggle of the 150,000 permanent rural workers, of the 350,000 itinerant rural workers, nd of the 60,000 small farmers and other peasants totally indebted to the Agriculture nd Livestock Development Institute [INDAP] and the banks!

orward with the organization and demands of the youths who have no future because he dictatorship has denied them access to study and work!

orward with the joint action of all the women's organizations that seek freedom and ustice, as well as life and security for their children!

orward with the organization and struggle of workers for the Minimum Salary Program PEN] and Employment Plan for Heads of Families [POJH], as well as with the struggle f all the unemployed people who suffer daily from hunger, misery, humiliation, and he lack of rights!

orward with the claims of the retired people, who live on pensions and government ssistance, who are protesting the deterioration of their income!

orward with the active mobilization of the professionals and other specialized workers, s well as small- and medium-sized businessmen in favor of their most dear demands!

orward with the effort to make the Armed Forces break away from the tyrant and his ower group, to allow the Armed Forces return to the people!

Let us rally our forces!

Let us voice our demands louder than ever!

Let us unite in action!

Let us march decidedly, through large-scale mobilization of the masses, towards a national stoppage for as many days as necessary and let us face vigorously the dictatorship!

This is the way to triumph. Tyranny willnot be able to resist the avalanche of the masses. When determined and organized people decide to conquer freedom and democracy, nothing and no one can stop them.

Out with Pinochet! Democracy now, in 1986, not later!

We will triumph with reason and force!

[Signed] Central Committee of the Chilean Communist Party. January 1986.

CHILEAN POLITICAL PARTIES DEMAND END TO EXILE POLICY

PY201509 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2130 GMT 19 Feb 86

["Text" of declaration issued on 16 February by Punta Arenas political parties]

[Text] The political parties of the Magallanes region hereby inform the public at the regional, national, and international levels that they categorically repudiate the imposition of any kind of exile; that on several occasions and through various means they have demanded an end to this true national scourge; that th roughout Chilean history exile has never solved any of our problems -- a perfect example being our august exile, Bernardo O'Higgins -- that the promises that have been made repeatedly by the government have not been fulfilled in full thus causing uncertainty to thousands of Chileans who have the right to live in their fatherland; and that social organizations, political parties, political coalitions, human rights organizations at the national and international level and the Catholic Church have requested an end to this shameful discrimination at all levels.

In view of this the Magallanes political parties that are signatories of this statement express their support for the ceremonies that have been planned by the Punta Arenas Committee for the Return of Exiles and for the meeting of Chilean and Magallanes exiles to be held in Rio Gallegos, Argentina from 24 to 29 March 1986.

They also extend their greetings to Chilean exiles living in many countries of the world and praise them for their efforts to get near their homeland and to meet their relatives and friends.

"Signed": Christian Democratic Party: Carlos (Vladimic); MAPU [United Popular Action Party]: Eduardo Ojeda; Christian Left: Manuel Rodriguez; Chilean Socialist Party; Pedro Munoz; Radical Party ; Alfredo Miranda; Socialist Party: Luis Rechena (Aiscorde); Communist Party: Julian Ramos. Punta Arenas, 16 February 1986.